Volume XXXVIII] *April, 1933* [*Number 3*

The

American Historical Review

TORONTO MEETING
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

THE Forty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Association was held in Toronto on December 27, 28, and 29. This was the first time in its history that the Association has crossed the borders of the United States. To go to Toronto, however, was not to visit a foreign country, nor from the Canadian point of view was the meeting an "American invasion". For many years the Association has numbered among its members scores of Canadians, and scholars like Bourinot, Wrong, and Biggar have served on its Council. Their active interest in its work has not conflicted with a loyal support of the Canadian Historical Association and of the ably conducted *Canadian Historical Review*. Indeed, the two associations held a joint session on the last day of the meeting.

Other societies, besides the Canadian Historical Association, meeting concurrently, were the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Conference of Historical Societies, the Agricultural History Society, the American Catholic Historical Association, the National Council for Social Studies, and the American Society of Church History. In view of the long continued depression, with salary cuts, failing dividends, and frozen bank deposits, dame rumor had remarked confidentially that the attendance would be small. The fear *complex* did not survive an hour under the bright sunshine of Toronto, with numbers constantly swelling until the registered attendance reached 423.

The University of Toronto was the host of the Association and of its sister societies, and generously did it perform this function. A feature especially pleasant was the plan of quartering members in the dormitories, consoling to shrinking pocketbooks, and, better still, reminiscent of far away college days. On the evening of the first day the University entertained the associations and societies at a banquet in the Great Hall of Hart House, which recalled the halls of Oxford and Cambridge, although on a much larger scale. The ceremonial of the occasion was

especially interesting to the strangers from a country whose traditional customs have suffered a losing fight. The roast, the pudding, and the great ram's head snuff box were brought in to the sound of the pipes and the drum. After toasts to the King and the President, toasts were given to the Association and to Clio, the Muse of History. The Honorable Vincent Massey in an interpretative and witty speech proposed the toast to the Association, and the response was given by Dr. Charles A. Beard, vice president of the Association, who, after amusing introductory remarks, declared that often the historian has the task of courageously recording truths unpalatable to the interests of the hour. The toast to Clio was proposed in classical phrase by Sir Robert Falconer, former president of the University, and the response was made by Professor Dixon Ryan Fox, who rejoiced many of his hearers by his diverting, and sometimes caustic, analysis of the work, recently in vogue, of the debunkers and their kindred. The address of welcome by President Cody was so moving in its warmth that his hearers were made readier even than before to go away as ambassadors of good will to the two nations.

The University recognized the distinguished historical work of President Bolton and honored the Association by conferring upon him the degree of doctor of laws. This was done at a special Convocation immediately preceding the Presidential Address. The Trustees of the Royal Ontario Museum gave a reception to members of visiting associations. A similar reception was given at the Toronto Art Gallery, and at Wymilwood, a tea to the ladies.

The interest with which the members crowded into the sessions and entered into discussions showed how successful the Committee on Program, of which Professor Chester Martin was chairman, had been in shaping plans for the meeting. There was a praiseworthy effort to limit the number of papers in a section, in order to give opportunity for discussion. In two cases the discussion was preceded by a single paper. In another the discussion took the form of a round table. The plans made by the Committee on Local Arrangements, of which Professor C. N. Cochrane was chairman and Professor G. W. Brown secretary, also worked out to the convenience of everybody.

At a meeting held on Canadian soil it was natural that many topics of mutual interest should be placed upon the program. No fewer than nine of the papers, scattered through the sessions, had subjects of this type. Two of them were presented at the joint session of the Canadian and American Historical associations. It was there that Professor D. A.

McArthur, of Queen's University, discussed the Boundary Provisions of the Quebec Act. A paper which naturally provoked some comment in the Toronto newspapers was Canada and the Peace Settlement of 1782, in which Samuel Flagg Bemis, of the George Washington University, explained how narrowly Toronto escaped being included within the boundaries of the United States. Franklin, he said, had always been eager to obtain all Canada, including Nova Scotia, but Franklin and Jay were afraid that Spain, backed by France, would extend her boundaries east of the Mississippi and exclude the United States from the great valley. To guard against such a danger the American negotiators accepted a compromise in the north. Dr. Bemis added that it was only an accident that Lord Shelburne accepted the river and lake line rather than the forty-fifth parallel. Had the forty-fifth parallel been chosen, Toronto and southern Ontario would have been included within the limits of the republic. Bearing on the same general period in the history of the two countries was a paper by Nelson V. Russell, of Coe College, with the title of The Royal Navy as a Factor in the British Control of the Old Northwest from 1760 to 1796. Until the time when the Jay Treaty went into effect, said Professor Russell, the British maintained an exclusive control of the Upper Great Lakes and the Upper Mississippi. It was threatened by Pontiac in 1763 and by the revolting colonists in 1775–1783. One of the interesting features of the paper was the part played in the fur trade by government ships built at Navy Island, near Niagara, and at Detroit.

A career interesting for the American phase of the Napoleonic struggle with England was that of Charles Williamson, whom Isaac J. Cox, of Northwestern University, in his paper described as the Western Watch-dog of the British Empire. Williamson, said Professor Cox, sought to utilize the American situation in such a way as to contribute to the defeat of France. The bait he held out to the Americans was a share in the trade with the Spanish colonies. After the *Chesapeake* affair he laid plans to check the warlike tendencies of people along the Atlantic Coast. He died on a secret mission to Cuba after Napoleon had seized Spain. More directly related to Canada was the paper of Harold A. Innis, of the University of Toronto, upon the Interrelations between the Fur Trade of Canada and the United States. This trade developed in the two countries along different lines after the people of the United States began to expand into the far Northwest. The elements in the Trans-Mississippi country were the cultural traits of the Indians, especially on the plains, the onward march of settlers to arable lands, and

the relative importance and rapid exploitation of coarse furs and hides as in the case of the buffalo. In Canada, on the contrary, the trade assumed a more permanent character. Its route shifted from the St. Lawrence to Hudson Bay. Professor Innis added, as a significant fact, that during the past year the Hudson's Bay Company boat made no visit to the depot at Charlton Island in James Bay for the first time in two and a half centuries.

Another paper of joint interest came from the section on Agricultural history, Fred Landon, of the University of Western Ontario, dealing with the Effects of the Civil War in the United States upon Canadian Agriculture. At the opening of the war the Canadians, Professor Landon said, hoped under the reciprocity treaty of 1854 to find a good market for their wheat. Unfortunately for them, their crops turned out badly, while at the same time the yield in the States was abundant. In this period, however, came the introduction from over the border of the new farm machinery, and Canadian capital established branch firms. To the same period of Canadian history belongs a paper on Railway Land Policies in Canada and the United States, in which James B. Hedges, of Brown University, combatted the common statement that the American policy was "transplanted bodily" into Canada. On the contrary, said Dr. Hedges, Canada made serious modifications, insisting that the land granted must be "fairly fit for settlement", and not requiring that it be within a specified distance, regardless of quality. In the field of general relations between Canada and the United States has been the establishment and efficient work of the International Joint Commission, the origin of which was discussed by Lawrence J. Burpee, its secretary. It has performed its delicate task with such harmony, said Dr. Burpee, that the public has been too little conscious of its significant achievements. With public opinion in mind, Dean Arthur A. Hauck, of Lafayette College, reported the results of an investigation upon the question of how the history of each country has been either emphasized or neglected in the textbooks of the other. On the whole the Canadian textbook writers have taken a broader view than their brethren south of the border, and Canadian children know more of the history of the United States than "American" schoolboys know of Canada.

The members from over the border were naturally interested in problems more especially Canadian, and certain of them, conscious of their incomplete knowledge of Canadian history, were eager to assume the attitude of learners. The central problem is, of course, that of the viability of the British Commonwealth—"autonomous communities . . .

equal in status . . . united in a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated . . .". The discussion of this theme was opened by the Honorable N. W. Rowell, K.C., of Toronto, in a paper with the subtitle of An Interpretation, a paper distinguished by a grace of expression, a clarity of treatment, and a mastery of the elements of the situation only achieved after lifelong familiarity with the questions involved. Two features would particularly attract the stranger's notice, the opinion that trade agreements, like those recently made at Ottawa, are as likely to cause irritating differences as common satisfactions, and the conviction that after all the principal tie of the empire is spiritual, a common origin, common institutions and literature, and a common loyalty to the King. In the further discussion W. Y. Elliott, of Harvard University, noted the fact that at Ottawa there was no general agreement, only twelve separate pacts. A. L. Burt, of the University of Minnesota, formerly of the University of Alberta, said it was useless to suppose that Canada could act at such a conference without taking into account her relationships with her neighbor to the south. The same fact also was emphasized in the section on the Far East, Norman A. M. MacKenzie, of the University of Toronto, pointing to the classical case of Canadian insistence at the Imperial Conference of 1921 upon the abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Mutual Assistance. Two other subjects from Canadian history were: Church and State in Canada, presented by K. H. Cousland, of Emmanuel College, and The Elective Council of Quebec, 1647–1663, by Gustave Lanctot, of the Public Archives of Canada. This council may be called, said Dr. Lanctot, the first Canadian Parliament.

The theme of the Presidential Address of Herbert E. Bolton, of the University of California, was especially appropriate in a meeting on Canadian soil, where uppermost in thought were the historical relations of two great countries of North America, for it was a masterly synthesis of the development of the Western Hemisphere. Dr. Bolton presented a point of view which should correct our perspective in considering the history of the Americas, South as well as North. His address appears in this issue of the *Review*. Before the address opened Dr. Bolton was presented a handsome work in two volumes entitled *New Spain and the Anglo-American West,* a contribution offered by former students. It is a collection of source materials with introductory essays and annotations. It includes a list of Dr. Bolton's writings.

Turning to other fields of history it is apparent that certain subjects gained a place on the program because of present-day analogues. Of

these one touched the question of international indebtedness, a subject with possibilities of reverberations. The American people, it seems, are not the first to be described as "rapacious Shylocks," according to Reginald C. McGrane, of the University of Cincinnati, who read a paper on Some Aspects of American States' Debts in the 'Forties. The two states involved were Mississippi and Florida. The agents of those states, "high pressure" salesmen, had violated statutes in negotiating loans, and bankers, in the traditional manner, had aided and abetted them. Certain Englishmen were ill-advised enough to accept the rôle of investors. When the states repudiated their obligations, and neither the British nor the American governments could do anything about it, the bondholders endeavored to awaken the moral consciousness of the American public. It was then that political leaders in the legislatures of the two states raised the Shylock cry, but the moral consciousness of the American public continued to repose. Another aspect of the international debt problem concerned the Caribbean states. This was dealt with by J. F. Rippy, of Duke University, in a paper entitled The British Bondholders and the Roosevelt Corollary of the Monroe Doctrine. Professor Rippy presented evidence to show that the action of British bondholders prompted Roosevelt to declare that if the United States would not permit European governments to intervene in a Spanish-American state to secure the payment of debts, the United States would itself be forced to act as sheriff. But Professor Rippy also showed that that intervention by the northern neighbor did not always bring about results satisfactory to the European bondholder, who saw funds earmarked for him turned over to rival syndicates from the United States.

Closely related to the subject of debts is the rise of Investment Banking in the United States during the years 1861 to 1873. This was the subject of a paper by Henrietta M. Larson, of the Harvard School of Business Administration. Dr. Larson showed that it was Jay Cooke, as agent of the Treasury during the Civil War, who first built up an effective organization for the sale of bonds. At the close of the war the bankers had to shift their field of operations, but they maintained their system of procedure. Those who bought Western railroad bonds too freely after 1866 discovered in 1873 reasons to regret the persuasive methods adopted by the bankers, when they, and sometimes the bankers too, went down in ruin. However, although individuals perished the system remained. A question of debts, on this occasion domestic, and at the same time of farm relief, an historical version of a present difficulty, was described by John D. Hicks, of the University of Wisconsin,

in a paper entitled Some Populist Panaceas. Professor Hicks believed that if the farmers had divorced their schemes from paper money inflationist remedies they might have secured relief. Their "Sub-treasury" plan was to accept the farmer's grain for storage and give him paper, with which he was to carry on. Another plan of land loans was to prevent the foreclosures of mortgages by handing the farmer paper money secured on his land. When these schemes failed the farmers turned to free silver and to Bryan. All this reads uncomfortably like passages from the daily press of 1933.

No subject directly connected with the World War appeared on the program. The nearest approach was the paper presented by William E. Lingelbach, of the University of Pennsylvania, on Belgian Neutrality: Origin and Successive Crises. Even here the principal emphasis was laid upon the first part of the theme, in dealing with which Professor Lingelbach offered new evidence to show that the idea of a neutral state, after the manner of Switzerland, probably did not arise first in Talleyrand's mind, but was suggested to him by Palmerston, acting in this case for the powers who wished to guard against possible French annexation. The violation of Belgian territory in 1914 entered, however, into the discussion that followed. The other papers in the section on Modern Europe dealt with Robespierre and Bernadotte. Robespierre's Reputation in the Constituent Assembly was analyzed step by step by W. B. Kerr, of the University of Buffalo. At first rather slow of wit, unequal to quick interchange in debate, likely to bring forward general accusations without the evidence to back them, it was not, Professor Kerr believed, until the Constituent Assembly had nearly run its course, and then chiefly in the Jacobin Club, that Robespierre acquired the art of managing a sympathetic audience. At times his pose as a willing martyr to the popular cause made him lose ground rather than win adherents. Franklin D. Scott, of the Wisconsin State Teachers' College, by his work in various European archives, but especially with the documents copied by the late Professor Oscar Alin from the Bernadotte Family archives, was able to outline Bernadotte's plans more fully than has hitherto been possible, and to explain the maneuvers, especially of Metternich, which rendered them without result.

There was a feeling among some students in the field of Modern European history that more than one section should have been given to it. But a glance at the program shows that other sections carried subjects ordinarily scheduled in that field. For example, in the section on Agricultural history, V. Alton Moody, of the Iowa State College of

Agriculture, presented a paper on Agrarian Reform before Post-War European Constituent Assemblies, which showed what such assemblies in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and the Baltic states had done to break up great estates into small holdings, and pointed out that Jugoslavia, Roumania, and Spain had preferred to turn over the problem to future legislatures. Another paper, this time in the section on Diplomatic history, read by Frederick Merk, of Harvard University, explained how Aberdeen, having negotiated the Oregon Treaty, secured favorable reactions from influential newspapers and quarterlies like the *Examiner,* the *Times,* the *Edinburgh Review,* and the *Quarterly Review.* Professor Merk entitled his paper British Government Propaganda and the Oregon Treaty. A paper dealing with a diplomatic situation of the same period was presented in the British history section by F. S. Rodkey, of the University of Illinois. Its title was Palmerston and a Concert of Powers on the Eastern Question, 1833–1838. Professor Rodkey made it plain that Palmerston came to such a plan when it was too late, after rejecting overtures for common action suggested especially by Metternich.

An important contribution to the social history of the modern period was also given in the section on British history: British Coal Miners and the Government, 1840 to 1860, by Walter L. Slifer, of Butler University. Professor Slifer pointed out the difference between legislation and enforcement, and gave an account of Hugh Seymour Tremenheere, a Whig, appointed by the Tory home secretary as commissioner to see that the new, humanitarian laws were enforced. For sixteen years Mr. Tremenheere held the position, and for many years afterward remained in fact, if not in name, a national social worker for the miners. That very ominous aspect of recent world history which is called the Far Eastern Question was treated in a paper entitled Certain Psychological Factors in the Present Far Eastern Situation, by H. F. MacNair, of the University of Chicago. Professor MacNair characterized the traits of passive resistance, procrastination, and the attitude of superiority displayed by the Chinese with the mental alertness and tendency to drastic action which the Japanese possessed. He also noted the ability of the Russians to cope with Orientals on their own ground. He said that competent observers found nothing surprising in the present situation.

The Reformation used to be included in Modern European history, but it receives little attention on programs at the present time. For some years after the close of the World War history seemed to begin with the alliances and ententes which led to the catastrophe of 1914. Our interests are now slowly moving back once more to the study of earlier problems.

Albert Hyma, of the University of Michigan, touched the introductory phases of the Reformation in his paper on Erasmus and the Oxford Reformers. His main contention was that the first visit of Erasmus to England did not have the determinative influence upon him that certain French and German students have asserted, that he never broke with scholasticism, since he was never seriously interested in it, and that his attitude toward monasticism underwent no transformation in England, because his friends Colet and More were not opposed to monasticism and asceticism. A late phase of the general reform movement was dealt with by M. M. Knappen, of the University of Chicago, in a paper entitled Causes of the Puritan Failure in England, 1640–1660. Professor Knappen attributed the failure to the rise of secular influences, coming from the Renaissance, to the increasing prosperity of the mercantile class, the lawyers, and the gentry, making them restive under Puritan social control, and to the lack of aggressive leadership on the part of the Puritan clergy themselves, accustomed to the idea of state control in the Church. Professor Hyma's paper was read in the section on the Renaissance. The other paper presented there dealt with a problem in the field of trade. It was entitled Venice, Spices, and Ship-Timbers in the Commercial Revolution, and it was given by Frederic C. Lane, of the Johns Hopkins University. In briefer form it presented the same thesis as Dr. Lane's article in the January number of the *Review*, significantly modifying our previous views of the decline of Venetian shipping.

In the Medieval history section two papers, by James F. Willard, of the University of Colorado, and Professor N. Neilson, of Mount Holyoke College, noted important progress in research procedure in English history. Professor Willard, who is director of the project entitled The English Government at Work, 1327–1336, declared that the sum total of the several studies made thus far give us, what we have never had before, a picture of the various officers and departments working simultaneously, thus making clear their interrelations. Professor Neilson described a plan in practice at Mount Holyoke for the effective study of the English Plea Rolls, in spite of their great bulk and unwieldiness. Hidden away in these rolls, she remarked, is much information of importance for social history, occupations of litigants, chattels found in homes, lists of law books, and ecclesiastical works. She suggested that other groups of graduate students might undertake similar analyses of the rolls of the court of common pleas, one year in a decade, perhaps, or one year in a quarter century. The third paper, by J. C. Russell, of the University of North Carolina, gave an interesting account of the Procedure of Medieval

Assemblies, according to which there must have been a happy custom of silence on the part of some members, the lesser people probably expressing their feelings by inarticulate but appropriate sounds, with no right to extend them in the *Record*. The voting was done by the king, and if the decision was unpalatable the losing faction could attempt a revision on the field of battle.

The Round Table Discussion on the Economic History of the Ancient World resolved itself into a session much like the others. It was opened by A. E. R. Boak, of the University of Michigan, who described the results obtained from the excavations at Dimê, a Ptolemaic settlement in the Fayum, whose most prosperous time was in the Roman period from Augustus to Caracalla. Professor Boak also mentioned other results learned from papyri from Tebtunis and Karanis. William S. Ferguson, of Harvard University, dealt with recent contributions to the financial history of Athens. The third speaker, William L. Westermann, of Columbia University, spoke of the important economic agreements incorporated in the federation of the Hellenes established by Philip the Second in 338–337 B. C., and alluded to by Demosthenes in Oration 17. These agreements, Professor Westermann explained, included a provision for keeping the seas free from pirates, and promises on the part of the federated states not to free slaves for the purposes of revolution, or wipe out debts, or redistribute land.

Those papers which dealt jointly with the history of the United States and Canada have already been mentioned. Other papers dealt primarily with the historical problems of the United States. The first section mentioned on the program was devoted to an attempt to define The National Interest. Charles A. Beard discussed the Original American Conception of National Interest. The ideas of dynastic interest and of national honor, said Dr. Beard, gave way, and both the constitution of the United States and the foreign policies of Washington were founded upon conceptions and realities of interest. Dr. Beard, among other things, pointed out that in the hands of Hamilton national interest became in essence the doctrine of *Machtpolitik*. "National Interest" and Recent American Thought was the subject of Ralph H. Gabriel, of Yale University. Dr. Gabriel saw an advantage in the recent revival of attention given to the concept because it has led to a discussion of first principles, reflection upon which tends to check the formulation of hasty and inadequately considered social plans. One characteristic of a true formula should be the homely maxim of "putting one foot before the other". The general discussion was led by Professor Arthur C. Cole, of Western Reserve University.

Another section was given to the Colonial period. Here a paper on Personnel and Personalities in the Colonial Agencies, by Ella Lonn, of Goucher College, threw new light upon a group of which Benjamin Franklin was the most notable member. Professor Lonn has enumerated 200 of these agents, beginning with the year 1666. In thirty-four cases she has found that the same man served more than one colony. In some instances, however, each house of the colonial legislature had a separate agent. Some of the agents were colonists long resident in England, or even Englishmen. Edmund Burke was agent for New York at one time. The agent who had the longest record for service was Richard Partridge, who acted for Rhode Island forty years. Another phase of the Colonial period was discussed by Lawrence H. Gipson, of Lehigh University, under the caption of The Iron Act of 1750. Professor Gipson expressed the belief that Englishmen in the second quarter of the eighteenth century were alarmed by what they assumed was an astonishingly rapid development of the iron industry in the American colonies. This, with the existing dependence upon Swedish and Russian supplies of bar-iron, led them to anticipate dire economic and social consequences to the mother country, unless effective measures were taken. The consequence was that Parliament proposed to admit American pig-iron and bar-iron free of duty, getting rid of dependence on extra-empire sources, and to forbid the Americans the subsequent erection of slitting, rolling, or steel mills, in order to retain the American market for English finished products. It is unnecessary to add that the law was not obeyed by the colonists. Another phase of colonial life was treated by W. M. Gewehr, of American University, in a paper with the title of the Religious and Social Revolution in Eighteenth Century Virginia. Here Professor Gewehr traced the influence of the evangelical revivals of the eighteenth century in strengthening the position and influence of the Presbyterians, Methodists, and especially of the Baptists. The Baptists, he said, were in 1760 regarded as a poor, contemptible, and illiterate sect, but by 1790 they had become the most numerous and popular denomination in the state.

Two papers were given to the Revolutionary period: Propagandists of the American Revolution, by Philip Davidson, of Agnes Scott College, and The Whig Opposition in England during the American Revolution, by G. H. Guttridge, of the University of California, whose paper was read in his absence by Professor J. J. Van Nostrand. The most interesting illustration which Professor Davidson gave concerned the methods used by such men as Samuel Adams, William Livingston, William Henry Drayton, and Thomas Paine to discredit Lord North's

conciliatory measures announced in April, 1778. These writers, like their successors during the World War, appear to have been more concerned with the end they desired to reach than with the truth of what they alleged. Facts were distorted and rumors propagated. According to Professor Guttridge the main reason why the Whig opposition was ineffective was the great variety of independent men and opinions that made up the opposition. Even leaders like Chatham and the Rockinghams would not work together since they distrusted one another.

Much was said at the meeting of the late Professor Turner. At the dinner of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and of the Agricultural History Society there was read an illuminating sketch and appreciation of his "Traits and Contributions", written by Professor Ulrich B. Phillips, who was unfortunately detained from the meeting. It was interesting to be thus admitted to the intimacies of Turner's graduate classes. A session was given to the discussion of Turner's chief thesis, the discussion being opened by Frederic L. Paxson, of the University of California, with a paper entitled A Generation of the Frontier Hypothesis, 1893–1932. Of Turner's four main positions Professor Paxson thought that the theory of the influence of the frontier upon democracy should be restudied in comparison with the history of nineteenth century democracies which approached the same goal by different routes. Professor Paxson said that Turner's conclusions in regard to the influence of the frontier upon nationalization were impregnable. Another feature of the process was the opportunity which each new region had, as it came to adolescence, to look over the common stock of institutions and remodel them to suit its needs. The discussion was further carried on by C. H. Ambler, of West Virginia University, whose paper was read in his absence, and by B. F. Wright, of Harvard University. At the joint dinner already mentioned Professor L. B. Schmidt, of Iowa State College, discussed another phase of the frontier under the title of The Prairies and Plains of our Times.

Three subjects belonging to Spanish-American history were considered besides that touched in Professor Rippy's paper. The relations of church and state were brought out in the treatment of Archbishop Juan de Zumarraga, First Archbishop in the Western Hemisphere, by Benjamin Webb Wheeler, of the University of Michigan. Zumarraga, a Franciscan friar, came to Mexico in 1528 and had a hand, therefore, in the coördination of civil and ecclesiastical government. According to Dr. Wheeler he was an aggressive spirit, but his wrath was found invariably on the side of justice, in defense of the crown, and of the welfare

of the natives. This paper was read in the joint session of the Association and of the Society of Church History. The other two papers belong to a later age. Roy F. Nichols, of the University of Pennsylvania, described the First United States Consuls and Trade Relations with the Spanish-American Empire, beginning with the delicate situation which arose soon after the Northern colonies declared their independence. Spain, Professor Nichols pointed out, was in principle as determined to exclude the United States from trade with her colonies as she was the older states of Europe, but during her wars with Great Britain she was obliged to resort to the United States for necessary supplies. This gave American traders a taste for profits from Hispanic colonial business, and appetite grew with eating. In a third paper, P. A. Martin, of Stanford University, strove to do belated justice to the memory of Artigas, the Founder of Uruguayan Nationality, and to give him a more assured position with Bolívar, San Martín, Miranda, and other liberators of Spanish America.

The problem of instruction, the assembly of material, and the publication of documents were discussed at the meeting. At a joint session with the National Council for Social Studies the chairman of the Commission on Social Studies, Professor A. C. Krey, presented a paper explaining what he entitled Our Experience with the Use of the New-Type Test in the Investigation of the Social Studies in the Schools. George M. Wrong, professor emeritus in the University of Toronto, speaking of The Historian's Duty to Society, noted the waning influence of the historians, partly because they tended to write for the expert rather than for the wide public, as in Macaulay's day.

The problems of graduate instruction provoked a lively discussion. The writers of the two leading papers, Guy Stanton Ford, of the University of Minnesota, and Evarts B. Greene, of Columbia University, were unhappily detained from being present, but their papers were read. Professor Ford characterized the Students while Professor Greene dealt with Instruction. Utilizing the conclusions of a report made by Professor J. P. Baxter's committee for the Social Science Research Council, and drawing upon his own wide experience, Professor Ford gave a composite photograph of the graduate student. The lines which he drew brought into clear view the elements of the present disconcerting situation. Professor Greene distinguished between the two classes of graduate students, the candidates for the master's degree and those who were ready to go forward to the doctorate. He dealt especially with the ways of selecting, guiding, and stimulating the latter. He deprecated the ten-

dency to dissertations unduly long and cumbrous in style, urging more attention to the problem of presentation. In the discussion that followed Dr. Conyers Read emphasized the right of those students who expect to take only the master's degree and to become teachers, to more attention than they now receive, if for nothing else because they furnish most of the income of the graduate schools. He also deprecated the tendency to "regiment" able young scholars, who would develop best only if they enjoyed more freedom and felt greater responsibility. Professor Baxter, author of the report already referred to, also took part in the discussion.

In the section on the Public Archives, Thomas P. Martin, of the Library of Congress, described the National Archives building which is now rising above its foundations in Washington. Dr. Martin's explanations of the plan made his hearers all the more eager for the day nearly two years distant when the completed building may be open to scholars. A paper on Archival Legislation was read by George S. Godard, of the Connecticut State Library. A. G. Doughty, of the Public Archives, Ottawa, described the Public Archives of Canada, which members of the Association were invited to visit after the close of the meeting.

One of the most practical discussions took place in the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies. It was opened by a paper, by Robert C. Binkley, of Western Reserve University, on Methods of Reproducing Research Materials. Among others who took part were Solon J. Buck, of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, and Julian P. Boyd, of the New York State Historical Association.

The business meeting of the Association was held on December 28. Announcements of unusual importance were made by the secretary, Professor Dexter Perkins. He first congratulated the Association upon the realization of a plan for an Executive Secretariat, which was the aim of a resolution adopted at the Durham meeting three years before. Through the generosity of the Carnegie Corporation the sum of $12,000 was made available for the fiscal year 1933. This would provide for the administrative expenses of the new office and leave approximately $1200 for urgent meetings of committees which have often been compelled to transact all business by correspondence. For the new post Dr. Conyers Read has been selected by the Council. His office is to be at 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia. Dr. Perkins added that the Council felt a "profound and unanimous conviction" of their good fortune in securing the "services of a man who has had at the same time a distinguished career as a scholar and large administrative and business experience". Dr. Perkins also said that the Council was confident that Dr. Read's

"administration of the affairs of the Association will afford ample evidence of the desirability of maintaining an officer of this type for the longer future".[1]

In reviewing the work of publication, in charge of committees, the secretary remarked that the Association has had an unusually successful year. He first mentioned the *Guide to Historical Literature,* the usefulness of which was indicated by the size of the year's royalties—$1663. The committee charged with the administration of the Littleton-Griswold Fund, he explained, will shortly publish the *Records of the Court of Appeals of Maryland,* with an introduction by the Honorable Carroll T. Bond, which is the first of a projected series in the field of legal history. Another volume, the *Records of the Mayoralty Court of New York City,* is ready for publication. A volume of *Records of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Rhode Island,* edited by Dorothy S. Towle, with an introduction by Professor Charles M. Andrews, is also planned. The committee in charge of the Beveridge Fund is making similar progress. Two of the projects now in train deal with aspects of slavery in the South. The secretary also mentioned the three volumes recently published with the aid of the Revolving Fund: John K. Shryock's *Origin and Development of the Cult of Confucius,* reviewed here in January; Nancy Lee Swann's *Pan Chao, Foremost Woman Scholar of China,* reviewed in this number; and Professor Frederick C. Dietz's, *English Public Finance, 1556–1641.* The committee which administers the fund has also approved the publication of a life of Shaftesbury, by Louise Fargo Brown. Only two or three more volumes may be provided for because the fund is becoming exhausted.

The secretary explained that the *Annual Report* for 1930, made up of four volumes, will include, in addition to the proceedings and the *Writings on American History,* a *Guide for the Study of British Caribbean History,* by Professor L. J. Ragatz, and the *Diary of Edward Bates,* edited by Howard K. Beale. The volume by Professor Ragatz has already appeared, as well as the first volume of the 1931 series, contain-

[1] The respective duties of the secretary and of the executive secretary were defined by the Council on November 25 as follows:

"Under the direction of the Council and the Executive Committee, the Executive Secretary shall promote historical scholarship in America through the agencies of the Association. He shall exercise general oversight of the affairs of the Association, supervise the work of its committees, formulate policies for presentation to the Council, execute its policies, and perform all duties not specifically within the sphere of other offices.

The Secretary of the Association shall arrange for meetings of the Council and of the Executive Committee, shall keep and circulate the minutes of the Council and the Executive Committee, and shall represent the Association in its legal capacity."

ing the Proceedings of the Forty-Sixth Annual meeting and the Report of the Committee on Linguistic and National Stocks in the Population of the United States, prepared for the American Council of Learned Societies. The *Report* for 1931 will also contain a *Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States,* compiled by S. F. Bemis and Miss Grace G. Griffin. The secretary declared that it was the policy of the Council to support adequately the annual publication of the *Writings,* and that through the generosity of the American Council of Learned Societies provision has also been made for a cumulative index of the volumes from 1906 to 1931, with Mr. David M. Matteson to supervise the work.[2]

Dr. Perkins spoke of the approaching completion of the work of the Commission on Social Studies in the Schools. In addition to Dr. Charles A. Beard's *A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools,* a stimulating volume by Professor Henry Johnson entitled *An Introduction to the History of the Social Sciences in Schools* has appeared during the year. Other volumes are in preparation. The report of the Committee on the Planning of Research,[3] published in a volume entitled *Historical Scholarship in America: Needs and Opportunities,* reviewed by Professor Evarts B. Greene in the January number of this journal, was also a subject of comment. Attention was called to the effective service rendered by the Public Archives Commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. A. R. Newsome, in compiling and distributing a pamphlet on *The Preservation of Local Archives.*

The secretary presented the problem of the finances of the Association, due in part to the serious shrinkage in membership brought about by the depression. He appealed for coöperation with the committee on membership in the effort to secure new members. He was able to report that in spite of the depression the Association had been able to complete the year with a balanced budget. This was due in part to care exercised in connection with certain large items of expense.

The secretary read a list of members who had died during the past year. A memorial of Frederick Jackson Turner written by Professor

[2] At the November meeting of the Council it was voted to include in the *Annual Report* for 1932 the addresses made on May 7 at the special meeting in commemoration of the Bicentennial of George Washington.

[3] At the November meeting of the Council it was voted to put into effect certain features of the program of the Planning Committee, especially the establishment of a monograph series and the publication periodically of a list of research and editorial projects being actively carried forward by mature scholars in the modern fields. The executive secretary was asked to submit a plan to the Council for such a series, and to prepare the list of projects.

Ulrich B. Phillips was also read. A memorial of John Bach McMaster was presented by Professor F. L. Paxson.

Because of the fear lest motives of economy should retard the publication of the Territorial Papers of the United States, it was voted, upon recommendation of the Council, to petition the Secretary of State to include the continuation of this project in the budget of the Department, and to petition the Congress to make provision for it in the appropriations. The resolution declared that "to discontinue or curtail this work now, would be, not an economy, but a waste". Its completion "will save public money by publishing in a single volume material which would otherwise have to be published by the several states with numerous repetitions and reprintings".

The following awards of prizes were announced: the George Louis Beer Prize, to Oswald Henry Wedel, of the University of Arizona, for his volume entitled *Austro-German Diplomatic Relations, 1908–1914;* the Jusserand Medal, to Howard Mumford Jones, of the University of Michigan, for a volume on *America and French Culture, 1750–1848.*

The officers chosen for 1933 are: Charles A. Beard, president; William E. Dodd, first vice president; M. I. Rostovtzeff, second vice president; Dexter Perkins, secretary; and C. E. McGuire, treasurer. The two new members of the Council are Julian P. Bretz and John D. Hicks.[4] J. Fred Rippy was elected to fill the vacancy on the Board of Editors caused by the resignation of J. Franklin Jameson. Dr. Jameson's resignation is deeply regretted by the members of the Board, to which he had given such distinguished service for thirty years, most of the time as managing editor. He was also managing editor during the first years of the *Review.*

The next meeting of the Association will be held at the University of Illinois in Urbana.

H. E. B.

[4] For a list of officers and committees, see Historical News. A summary of the treasurer's report appears in the same section.

THE EPIC OF GREATER AMERICA

I.

THE membership of the American Historical Association used to consist almost exclusively of residents of the United States. At the time when it was formed a more exact name for the organization would have been "The United States Historical Association". In recent years the situation has changed. The interests of the body have greatly expanded, and membership has come to include numerous citizens of other American countries, especially of Canada. This widening of the clientele and of the outlook of the Association, together with the holding of the present annual meeting in a Canadian city, would seem to give special fitness to a presidential address dealing with some of the larger aspects of Western Hemisphere history. I have therefore chosen for my subject this evening, The Epic of Greater America.

There is need of a broader treatment of American history, to supplement the purely nationalistic presentation to which we are accustomed. European history cannot be learned from books dealing alone with England, or France, or Germany, or Italy, or Russia; nor can American history be adequately presented if confined to Brazil, or Chile, or Mexico, or Canada, or the United States. In my own country the study of thirteen English colonies and the United States in isolation has obscured many of the larger factors in their development, and helped to raise up a nation of chauvinists. Similar distortion has resulted from the teaching and writing of national history in other American countries.

It is time for a change. The increasing importance of inter-American relations makes imperative a better understanding by each of the history and the culture of all. A synthetic view is important not alone for its present day political and commercial implications; it is quite as desirable from the standpoint of correct historiography.[1]

For some three hundred years the whole Western Hemisphere was colonial in status. European peoples occupied the country, transplanted their cultures, and adapted themselves to the American scene. Rival

[1] This is so patent that it hardly needs demonstration, and for the future I foresee generally in practice two types of school and college courses in American history: an introductory, synthetic course, embracing the entire Western Hemisphere, analogous to courses in general European history; and courses in the history of the United States or of any other individual nation. In fact, a movement in this direction is well under way.

nations devised systems for exploiting natives and natural resources, and competed for profit and possession. Some of the contestants were eliminated, leaving at the end of the eighteenth century Spain, Portugal, England, and Russia as the chief colonial powers in America.

By this time most of the European colonies in America had grown up; they now asserted their majority. In the half century between 1776 and 1826, practically all of South America and two-thirds of North America became politically independent of Europe, and a score of nations came into being. Eventually, the entire Western Hemisphere, with minor exceptions, has achieved independent nationality. Since separation from Europe these nations alike have been striving on the one hand for national solidarity, political stability, and economic well being, and on the other hand for a satisfactory adjustment of relations with each other and with the rest of the world.

Our national historians, especially in the United States, are prone to write of these broad phases of American history as though they were applicable to one country alone. It is my purpose, by a few bold strokes, to suggest that they are but phases common to most portions of the entire Western Hemisphere; that each local story will have clearer meaning when studied in the light of the others; and that much of what has been written of each national history is but a thread out of a larger strand.

II.

Columbus drew the curtain of the American stage not for Spaniards alone, but for all the European players. This navigator himself seems to have been international, if we may judge from the number of his birthplaces. His daring voyage set in motion a race for the Orient in which several nations took part. The Cabots for England reached the shores of northeastern America and returned home with boats smelling of fish. Portuguese adventurers, sailing around Africa, reached India and set up an empire there. Spain, finding the American continent in the way, sought a route through or around the unexpected nuisance. When Magellan found a southern strait for Spain, Verrazano and Cartier for France, and Thorne for England, in imitation, scurried to find a passage further north. Spain set the fashion; the others tried to keep the pace.

Discovery was followed by exploitation and colonization. This, likewise, was not a matter of one nation, but of many. Spain and Portugal led the way. They not only explored and exploited, but they colonized extensively and permanently, and their experience was utilized by later comers. In rapid succession Spain occupied the West Indies, Central

America, Mexico, and all South America except the eastern seaboard. There Brazil is an imposing monument to tiny Portugal. On the mainland Spaniards first settled among the advanced peoples—Mayas, Aztecs, Pueblos, Chibchas, and Incas. These natives were easiest to conquer, were most worth exploiting, and their women made the best cooks. It happened, too, that most areas of advanced primitive culture were regions rich in mineral deposits.

The dominant position of Spain and Portugal in America at the end of the sixteenth century was truly remarkable. No other European power had established a single permanent settlement. Portugal monopolized the Brazilian seaboard. Spain had colonies all the way from Buenos Aires to the Rio Grande. Two-thirds of the Western Hemisphere was then Hispanic, and so it has remained to this day. Spain's exalted position in the New World at the time is illustrated by the enemies who then rose up against her.

The North European countries and France founded no permanent American colonies in the sixteenth century. But all were interested in expansion in similar ways. All took to the sea. All desired a share in the trade of America and the Far East. All tried to break down the monopoly of Spain and Portugal. All made intrusions into the Caribbean and the South American mainland. Britons braved winds and ice floes in an effort to find a Northwest Passage. French sea dogs, Dutch sea dogs, and English sea dogs alike plundered vessels and sacked towns all round the Hispanic American periphery. In defence Spain adopted a commercial fleet system, formed a West Indian armada, and walled her towns on the Caribbean coasts. One of these stanch old defences tourists see today at Cartagena. The fortifications at Havana and St. Augustine had a similar origin. The French intruded into Carolina, Florida, and Brazil, but were effectively expelled from all three. Raleigh attempted to found colonies in Carolina; his Orinoco project sent him to the block. Drake became a millionaire by plundering Spaniards, was crowned Great Hioh by the Indians near San Francisco Bay, and talked of a New Albion in California, long before there was a New England on the Atlantic Coast.

Then a new chapter opened. At the dawn of the seventeenth century North Europe and France began to found permanent colonies in the Caribbean and on the North American mainland. Being late comers, they established themselves in the left over areas. We Saxon Americans to-day may regard our respective countries as Promised Lands, reserved for God's chosen people. But our Saxon ancestors froze and starved in

them primarily because their Hispanic contemporaries were firmly intrenched in the sunnier climes. The late comers made vigorous and long-continued attempts to get a foothold on the whole Atlantic seaboard of South America, but found the way blocked by the Portuguese. This is one of the chapters we forget.[2]

The favorite colonies of the late comers at the outset were those planted in the Caribbean and Guiana. French, Dutch, English, and Danes settled side by side in the Lesser Antilles, jostled each other, and warred with Spain. They established tropical plantations, trading stations, and buccaneering bases. Till the end of the century, investors' profits were vastly greater here than on the mainland. In 1676 the immigrant population of little Barbados alone was larger than that of all New England.

But the future for these new comers was in the northern continent, with its wide expanse, and its unappropriated back country. Here North Europe and France might hope to achieve something of the renown and a fraction of the wealth which Hispanic Europe had won in Mexico and South America. So France, Holland, Sweden, and England all planted colonies on the northern main.

The details need not detain us. France occupied Acadia, the St. Lawrence Valley, the Alabama and Mississippi basins, and the Canadian prairies. The Swedes and the Dutch settled on the Delaware and the Hudson. England founded subtropical plantations in the South, diversified colonies on the Dutch and Swedish foundations, a coastwise and industrial society in New England, fishing stations in the northeastern waters, and fur trading posts about the shores of Hudson Bay. New England was redolent of fish and brimstone; New France at first was largely a matter of skins and souls—the skins of beaver and the souls of the heathen.

Thus by the end of the seventeenth century European colonies and trading posts formed a fringe like a figure eight clear around the rim of both Americas, from Hudson Bay to the head of the Gulf of California. Middle America was occupied from ocean to ocean, and long salients had been thrust into the interior of the wider continental areas. England alone had not thirteen but nearly thirty colonies in the islands and on the Atlantic seaboard, strung all the way from Guiana to Hudson Bay. As commonly used, the phrase "Original Thirteen" has been very misleading and even pernicious. It does not mean the original colonies at all, but the original states of the American Union.

[2] England striped the Spanish Main (northern South America) with sea to sea grants which on the map look just as imposing as the more familiar grants in North America.

In these peripheral regions of the two continents the Europeans settled on the land, adjusted themselves to the American environment, devised systems for utilizing natural resources, and transplanted European cultures. Governments were set up, cities founded, religious institutions perpetuated, schools and colleges begun. The universities of Mexico and Lima date from 1551, the Jesuit College of Quebec, ancestor of Laval University, from 1635, Harvard from 1636, William and Mary from 1695, and Yale from 1701. Till near the end of the eighteenth century not Boston, not New York, not Charleston, not Quebec, but Mexico City was the metropolis of the entire Western Hemisphere.

Likenesses in the colonial systems were more striking than differences. All the nations entertained mercantilistic views of colonies—that is to say, they were for the benefit of their own people. Government at first was of the contemporary European pattern, adapted to the American frontier. Nearly every mother country revived in America some vestige of feudalism—Spain tried the encomienda, Portugal the *capitanía,* Holland the patroon system, England the proprietary grant, France the seigniory.

In all tropical areas Negro slavery was common. Native policies varied according to the natives. Indian tribes were everywhere used as buffers against European rivals. Intractable Indians were everywhere driven back or killed off. Sedentary tribes were subdued, preserved, and exploited. In New Spain they were held in encomienda; in South Carolina, Brazil, and Dutch America, and in the island colonies generally they were enslaved; in New France and in mainland English America they were utilized in the fur trade. Europeans who came without their women married native girls. Half breeds were numerous in Hispanic and French America, and squawmen were the rule on all French, Dutch, and English frontiers. In the Chickasaw nation in 1792 a fourth of the one thousand heads of Indian families were white men, mainly English. To-day French, English, and Scotch "breeds" are numerous in Manitoba, Labrador, and northern California, and dark cheeked oil queens are popular with white men in Oklahoma.

In one respect the Indian policies of the Latin countries differed essentially from those of the Saxons. The Latins considered the Indian worth civilizing and his soul worth saving. This was due largely to the influence of the Church. So in Brazil, Spanish America, and New France the missionary played a conspicuous rôle. There Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, Jesuits, and other orders labored on every border, and founded Indian missions and Indian schools. The brilliant

Parkman made widely known the heroic work of the Jesuits in New France. Less famous in Saxon circles is the equally heroic and vastly more extensive work of the Jesuits in Spanish and Portuguese America. In colonial Mexico alone there were probably ten times as many Jesuits as in New France.

III.

Beginning on the rim of the continent, these European settlers pushed into the interior, opening new mines, new missions, new plantations, new farms, new trading posts, new administrative jurisdictions. Sometimes the advance to the hinterland was a westward movement, sometimes it was eastward, sometimes southward, sometimes northward. Everywhere contact with frontier environment and native peoples tended to modify the Europeans and their institutions. This was quite as true in the Latin as in the Saxon colonies.

Colonial expansion involved international rivalry. This, too, embraced the entire hemisphere. In Saxon America the story of the "struggle for the continent" has usually been told as though it all happened north of the Gulf of Mexico. But this is just another provincialism of ours. The southern continent was the scene of international conflicts quite as colorful and fully as significant as those in the north.

Minor rivalries occurred in Guiana, where France, Holland, and England exploited the region side by side. England for a century tried without success to break into the Spanish Main, and called into being the viceroyalty of New Granada. Into Portuguese America the French and Dutch intruded with great vigor and dogged tenacity.

But the major contest for territory in the austral continent was between Brazil and her Spanish neighbors to the west and south. Here an empire equal in area to the Mississippi Valley was at stake. By papal grant and royal treaty Portugal was restricted to a narrow strip on the Atlantic shore. So said the documents. But this delimitation made little difference in fact. Snapping their fingers at decrees and treaties, hardy Brazilians pushed their frontiers rapidly west, founded Portuguese settlements in the interior, and plundered Spanish outposts on the Paraguay border. The Brazilian drive toward the Andes strongly resembles the westward movement in the United States and Canada.

Spain contested these inroads. In resisting them the Jesuits played a dramatic part. Their Paraguay missions became a buffer province to restrain the aggressive Portuguese. From middle Paraguay they extended their reductions above the great falls of the Paraná. There for

twenty years they prospered, and then the Portuguese hammer fell upon them. Within three years thousands of mission Indians were carried off as slaves to Brazil. With the remainder—twelve thousand neophytes—Father Montoya and his associates fled helter-skelter in river craft five hundred miles down the stream, skirting through tropical forests the ninety miles of falls and rapids that broke navigation. This stirring episode antedated by more than a hundred and twenty years the Acadian expulsion which it somewhat resembled, and it determined the fate of a territory vastly greater in size. Striking new root in the south, the Jesuits defended that border for another century, sometimes by open warfare. The left bank of the lower Plata was another scene of long continued give and take. Brazil edged south at her neighbor's expense, but Spain managed to hold the region that became the Republic of Uruguay. The middle eighteenth century saw the border contest come to a head. With English backing, Portugal had the advantage. In 1750 by treaty Brazil was given a boundary much like that of to-day. Thus the Line of Demarcation, fixed in the time of Columbus and Cabral, was sadly bent, and Brazil came to occupy nearly half of South America.

There was another chapter in this story. To restrain the Portuguese from further encroachments and to keep out the threatening English, who had now occupied the Falkland Islands, Spain established the viceroyalty of La Plata, with its capital at Buenos Aires. This was one of the significant American events of 1776. It did much to determine the destiny of the southern continent.

The scene now shifts to the top of the map. Here again the story has been distorted through a provincial view of history. The contest for North America is usually represented as falling between 1689 and 1763, confined chiefly to the valleys of the Ohio and the St. Lawrence, and ending on the Plains of Abraham. But this is far too restricted a view. The story neither began on the Ohio nor ended at Quebec.

In eastern North America territorial rivalry began with the first intrusions of other Europeans into Spanish possessions in the Caribbean. In the sixteenth century the intruders merely barked at the Spaniards' heels. In the seventeenth century, long before 1689, important transfers of territory were effected both in the islands and on the mainland. By settlement of unoccupied islands, England, France, and Holland absorbed many regions stubbornly claimed but neglected by Spain. England conquered Jamaica, and the French took western Haiti. On the mainland, both Virginia and South Carolina were settled by England in the face of Spanish resistance; Swedes on the Delaware and Dutch on

the Hudson soon found themselves in the maw of the British empire. For decades the buccaneers ravaged Spain's Caribbean shores. Jamaica was the focus; Seitz has given us a telling refrain:

> Ho! Henry Morgan sails today
> To harry the Spanish Main,
> With a pretty bill for the Dons to pay
> Ere he comes back again.

For this harrying Morgan, like Drake, was knighted.

Then followed the more militant rivalry which Parkman has so brilliantly depicted as the *Half Century of Conflict*. It was a death grip of England not with France alone but with both France and Spain for eastern North America. On the American mainland fur trade and Indian alliances played a significant rôle. In the Caribbean and Georgia the Anglo-Spanish contest still raged. Not only Louisbourg and Quebec, but also Cartagena, Porto Bello, Havana, and St. Augustine, were targets for English cannon.

The long struggle was marked by five European wars. In each of them nearly all international frontiers were war zones—the Caribbean, the Spanish Main, the Florida-Georgia border, Acadia, Hudson Bay. In the contest Carolinians duplicated on a smaller scale in Georgia and Florida the savage Portuguese raids on the Spanish missions of Paraguay. In one campaign an ex-governor of South Carolina destroyed thirteen Spanish missions, burned Fathers Parga and Miranda at the stake, and carried off more than a thousand mission Indians. Bit by bit England shaved off both borderlands. France yielded her claims to Hudson Bay, Newfoundland, and Acadia; Oglethorpe's intruding colony broke Spain's hold on Georgia. But "Old Grog" Vernon's disaster in the War of Jenkins's Ear checked English designs on the Spanish Main. There Spain remained intact, for yellow fever was a faithful ally of the Dons. Incidentally, through Washington's brother, who served in the Cartagena campaign, this war gave the United States a name for its national shrine, Mt. Vernon.

The final clash with France in this chapter of history came when English settlers threatened the French hold on the Ohio Valley. The classic story needs no repetition here. Leaden plates and a line of posts signalized French determination to hold on. France was encouraged by four years of success; the tide turned when Pitt took the helm for England. With Wolfe's victory on the Plains of Abraham, French rule in mainland North America ended.

But the close of French rule did not remove the French people. Here historians often forget. The French settlers remained, continued to be pathfinders in the West, and their prolific descendants to-day constitute a third of Canada's population. Yankee institutions have edged across the line into British North America. As an offset, French Canadians have pushed south and contributed greatly to the economic life of New England.

The end was not yet. The contest for the continent did not close with the Portuguese drive for the Andes, with the absorption of Spain's Caribbean islands, nor with England's victory at Quebec. Western North America was similarly involved. International rivalry was quite as much a feature of western as of eastern America, even in colonial days, and its story cannot properly be separated from the other. The stage for the contest for the continent was as wide as the hemisphere and its adjacent seas. It was international rivalry that brought into existence as organized communities nearly all the Spanish borderland areas of the Southwest and the Pacific Coast. These stirring episodes, if treated at all, have been considered only as local history, but they are a part of the general theme. They are no more local history than is the struggle for the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi Valley.

On her northern borderland Spain's expansion was largely defensive. The French intruded into Carolina and Georgia, Menéndez expelled them, and founded Florida. Into Texas Spain was forced by a later French intrusion. La Salle founded his short-lived colony on the Gulf as a base for seizing the mines of Mexico, not primarily, as Parkman says, to hold back the English. Spain, roused to action, planted temporary settlements in the Piney Woods of eastern Texas. Iberville founded Louisiana, split Spain's Gulf possessions in two, and France again threatened the western country. But Spain came back. By a counter stroke she now permanently settled Texas. In the course of the contest the Marqués de Aguayo marched a thousand miles, at the head of cavalry raised at his own expense, restored Spain's posts beyond the Trinity, and returned to the Rio Grande on foot, through loss of nearly five thousand horses in a blizzard. Aguayo saved Texas for Spain and made Napoleon's pretension and Jefferson's claim to the province as a part of Louisiana an historical joke. During the same international episode in which Aguayo recovered Texas for Spain, the French advance up the Platte River was met by a Spanish gesture from Santa Fe toward occupying the region which is now eastern Colorado.

Louisiana tells a similar story. The Seven Years' War gave North

America a new map west of the Mississippi as well as east of it. At the end of the struggle Spain found herself in possession of half of the former patrimony of France, and frowning at England across the Father of Waters. Acquired by Carlos III. in the stress of conflict, Louisiana was occupied and developed by Spain primarily as a buffer province to hold back first the English and then the Anglo-Americans.

Upper California was likewise a child of international rivalry. Jesuit missionaries had carried the Spanish frontier into Arizona and Lower California. There it stood. Then the Russian Bear threatened. Bering explored the North Pacific and Russians planted posts in Alaska. So Spain moved up the map once more. Portolá and Serra planted garrisons and missions at San Diego and Monterey. A few days before the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed in Philadelphia, San Francisco was founded on the Pacific Coast. It was planted as an outpost to hold the northwestern border of Spain's vast empire, a realm which extended from the Strait of Magellan to the Golden Gate. Though less a matter of bullets, the founding of San Francisco was as much a part of world history as was Wolfe's victory at Quebec. It was another of the significant events of 1776.

IV.

Then came the American Revolution. This too was by no means a local matter. It lasted half a century—from 1776 to 1826—and it witnessed the political separation of most of America from Europe. The event was perhaps inevitable. Spain, Portugal,, and England had founded vigorous colonies. They grew up and asserted their majority. The revolutions were the surest signs that the mother countries had succeeded. Thirteen of the English colonies led the way; Spanish and Portuguese America followed. Throwing off their status as wards, English, Spanish, and Portuguese colonists set themselves up as American nations. Viewed thus broadly the American Revolution takes on larger significance.

Of the revolt of the Thirteen English colonies little need be said before this audience. The causes were inherent in the situation. Beginning as a struggle for redress of grievances, it quickly became a war for independence. Soon the contest became international, a fact which determined the outcome. France, Spain, and Holland joined the colonial cause against England. Spain drove the British soldiery from the lower Mississippi and recovered the Floridas. In the final victory the French navy played a decisive part. The treaty of peace was a shock to

European monarchs. It recognized not only a Western Hemisphere nation, but a nation with a democratic form of government. Through hostility to England the rest of Europe had contributed toward the ultimate loss of all colonial America and toward the undermining of the monarchical system.

The independence of the United States was not fully assured by the surrender at Yorktown. For the next third of a century European interests in the Mississippi Valley were a menace to the continued independence and the growth of the new republic. The shadow of Europe lay deep over the West. The infant nation was not born a giant, and many persons of prominence thought it would fail. European powers looked on with interest. If the young upstart ceased to exist, they would be on hand to share the estate; if it survived, they would check its growth and dominate its fortunes. The danger was averted only by the jealousy and the long conflict among the Europeans themselves, and by the vigor of American growth. Spain threatened the Southwest. England occupied an analogous position north of the Ohio. France was more dangerous than either. She hoped to dominate the Ohio Valley, or even to separate it from the United States. In this she failed, but by browbeating Spain, Napoleon regained Louisiana. Then, suddenly, his colonial plans having changed, he sold it to the United States for a song. The shadow of France in the West was dispelled.

The revolt of thirteen of the thirty British colonies laid the foundations not of one but of two English speaking nations in North America. One was the United States; the other was the Dominion of Canada. Before 1776 Canada was mainly French in race stock. The settlers who now arrived made up the first large English speaking element in the country. In the revolt of the colonies the people were far from unanimous. Only thirteen of the provinces joined, though appeals were made to all. The Maritime Provinces, Quebec, the two Floridas, and the island colonies, all stood by the mother country. Even in the thirteen a third of the people were opposed to the revolution.

Under harsh treatment by the separatists, thousands of these Loyalists emigrated during and after the war. Going to Halifax became a well recognized pursuit. Some settled in the old Maritime Provinces, and others in newly formed New Brunswick. Still others flocked to Upper Canada—the Ontario of to-day. So British Canada was largely American in origin. These United Empire Loyalists, founders of this city,[3] and a multitude of others, were Canada's Pilgrim Fathers. It was they

[3] Toronto, where this address was delivered.

who did the most to shape the history of the vast domain north of the United States. The small seed of empire which they planted beside the French colony has grown to be the great Dominion of Canada.

Two American nations had been founded. But the revolution had only started. At the end of the eighteenth century only a small patch on the American map had won its independence from Europe. Portugal still ruled Brazil, and Spain's power was intact all the way from Patagonia to the borders of Oregon. But the revolution went on.

A third of a century behind the English colonies those of Spain and Portugal rose in revolt. In the two cases there were similarities and contrasts. The causes were in many respects alike. In both movements independence was achieved through outside aid. The area involved in Hispanic was ten times that in English America, and the population several times larger. In Hispanic America there were vastly greater obstacles to united action than in English America. Mountains and distance gave more effective isolation. As a consequence there were separate revolutionary movements in the different areas, and several nations resulted.

External influences played a prominent part in bringing the revolution about. England and France, trade rivals of Spain, plotted the liberation of her colonies. Subversive French philosophy penetrated Spanish America in spite of all efforts to keep it out. Young Creoles were educated in Europe. English and American contact through smuggling spread liberal ideas. The revolt of the English colonies, the French Revolution, and the independence of Santo Domingo furnished examples. Napoleon started the ball a'rolling by seating his brother Joseph on the throne of Spain. Spanish American resistance to the usurper soon changed into a war for separation.

Independence came to Brazil without bloodshed. Here as in Spanish America, Napoleon set things in motion. When he threatened to depose the Braganzas in Portugal, John, Prince Regent, fled with his court to Brazil. By his liberal policy he stirred new life in the quiescent colony. Brazil became a kingdom, John returned to Portugal and left his son Pedro as regent. Brazil and Portugal now grew apart. Ordered home, Pedro refused, raised the *Grito de Ypiranga,* declared for independence, and became emperor (1822).

The wars of independence in Spanish South America were an imposing military drama. Miranda the Precursor led the way in Venezuela. Bolívar the Liberator assumed his mantle. For fifteen years this brilliant figure moved back and forth across the continent, setting up

republics, defeated here, winning victories there. Then for a time the revolution was nearly stamped out. But Bolívar had a way of coming back. Aided by British volunteers—veterans released after Napoleon's fall—he crossed the Andes where they are thirteen thousand feet high, routed the royalists, and completed the revolution in the North. This Washington of South America well merited his title of *El Libertador*. In the North the dominating figure of Bolívar gave unity to the war. In the South there was less cohesion, but the cause prevailed. By 1816 the Argentine was practically free. Dr. Francia expelled the royalists and set up a republic in Paraguay. In the Banda Oriental Artigas, the picturesque Gaucho chieftain, laid the foundations of Uruguayan nationality. The rebel forces of the North and the South now closed in on Peru, the last royalist stronghold. San Martín, greatest soldier of the South, forged a new army at Mendoza, made a stupendous march over the Andes where they are twelve thousand feet high, and completed the revolution in Chile. Then, with fresh forces, carried north in a fleet commanded by a British admiral, he defeated the royalists at Lima, and turned his army over to the Liberator. Bolívar ascended the Andes, created the Republic of Bolivia, and ended the war in Spanish South America. Bolivia commemorates his name.

Simultaneously with these epic events North America ended the rule of Spain. Hidalgo rang the Liberty Bell and sounded the *Grito de Dolores*. Mexican school boys still bless him because he raised the cry precisely at midnight, for in order to be sure to celebrate the right day, both the fifteenth and the sixteenth of September are national holidays. The Philadelphia bell ringer was not so considerate. Hidalgo raised an armed mob, defeated the royalists, and seized government stores. Routed at Guadalajara, he fled north, was captured, and executed at Chihuahua. Rayón rose and fell. Then emerged Morelos, mule driver priest, the chief military figure in the war. His astounding victories were followed by a declaration of independence.

The revolt had spread like a flash to the northern provinces of New Spain, where it was given special character by the proximity of the United States. It must be remembered that at this time the Floridas, Texas, all the Southwest, and California were still parts of Spain. Occurrences there which in the nationalistic mold have been regarded as local events, in this larger perspective are seen to be important phases of the history of the New World.

The people of the United States favored the Mexican revolution. They had recently fought one themselves, and were flattered by the

imitation. They were interested in the spread of democracy, in Mexican commerce, and in Mexican land. Sam Houston of Tennessee, long before he became famous in Texas, offered to join the revolutionary cause there in return for real estate. There were boundary disputes between the United States and Spain, and now was a good time to settle them. So Mexico found many a helping hand. President Madison encouraged a revolution in West Florida, but when a republic was erected there he seized the district to keep order and to forestall England, for the War of 1812 was now in progress. In East Florida Madison fostered another short-lived revolt, with a similar purpose in view. Carolinians and Georgians ravaged the province but were expelled. Texas was "liberated" by a volunteer army raised in the United States, but was reconquered by Spain.

Meanwhile in Mexico the revolutionary congress fled from place to place, much as the Continental Congress had done before it. Heroic Morelos was captured and executed. But the revolt, now stamped out in the center, was kept alive on the frontiers. Here Western Hemisphere history was being made. Mina revived the spark by a raid from Texas. Andrew Jackson embarrassed Spain by invading East Florida, for Bahama Britons threatened. Uncle Sam took advantage of Spain's predicament to acquire title to both Floridas, which he already held by military force,[4] and to negotiate the boundary line of 1819. General Long led new expeditions from the United States into Texas, and set up a temporary republic. Galveston Island continued to be a base for proclamations and revolutionary raids. Bouchard, by an expedition that sailed all the way from Argentina, tried in vain to arouse contented California. On the far southern border of Mexico Guerrero kept up a guerrilla warfare.

Iturbide now brought the struggle to a climax. Sent by royalists to crush Guerrero, he joined hands with the rebel instead, and ended the rule of Spain. Then, making himself emperor, he carried the war of liberation into Central America. He in turn was soon overthrown, and the republic of Mexico was established, though shorn of the Floridas, eastern Texas, and Central America. The American Revolution had been fought and won. It did not end at Yorktown.

It was these events that called forth the Monroe Doctrine and that make it intelligible. European monarchs looked askance at the large crop of American republics. After the overthrow of Napoleon, that

[4] Brazil similarly seized Uruguay during the revolutionary disturbances, but relinquished it a few years later.

mutual insurance society at one stage called the Holy Alliance was formed to restore legitimate sovereigns. It essayed this task in Spain and in Italy, and then discussed the reconquest of Spanish America. Just then Russia took an aggressive position regarding Northwestern America. The czar declared the North Pacific a closed sea. In reply Monroe issued his famous dictum, denouncing further colonization of America by Europe and all plans to restore monarchy here. Russia now withdrew all claims below 54° 40′—hence the phrase later used as a campaign slogan—and the allies gave up their plans to restore Spanish rule in America. England's precise part in this episode is still a subject of debate.

In most of the new Hispanic states independence was followed by disorder—like the "Critical Period" in the history of the United States, or like Tennessee when Sevier and Tipton were ludicrously chasing each other around the map. The turbulence was due to political inexperience, social antipathies, geographical barriers, and sectional or personal ambitions. But the struggle was not meaningless chaos. In the long period of strife, cleavage in politics usually centered on fundamental issues: centralism versus federalism; civilian rule versus militarism; privilege versus opportunity.

Disorder led to one man power. Mysterious Francia in Paraguay, bloody Rosas in Argentina, and venal Santa Anna in Mexico are examples of *caudillos* or military chiefs who thus became dictators. The struggle for nationality in Spanish America during the first half century after independence is typified by the fortunes of Mexico. There disorder and inexperience led not only to dictatorship but also to foreign invasion and loss of territory. Mexico's career was given special character, and made more difficult, by proximity to the "Colossus of the North". Canada had a similar experience with her neighbor.

V.

Saxon America again occupied the center of the Western Hemisphere stage. All of Europe and America anxiously watched the drama. By the time the Hispanic states were established their territorial limits were fairly well fixed except on the north. The Spanish republics fitted into the *audiencia* districts of the old viceroyalties, whose outlines were already determined. Since independence there have been many boundary disputes in Hispanic America, Brazil has taken good-sized bites out of her neighbors' domain, but there have been few major transfers of territory.

Quite different was the case in Saxon America. When independence came to the United States and the Loyalists founded British Canada, most of North America above Mexico was still in the raw. Spain's holdings north of the Rio Grande were mainly defensive and missionary outposts. Beyond these, the major portion of the continent was Indian country, still in the fur trade stage. It lay in the pathway of several expanding peoples. It was an outpost of four empires, each of which contributed its pioneers. It was their land of opportunity, and it was anybody's prize. The ultimate domains of the three principal North American nations were still to be hammered out. The shaping of them was a primary interest of the Hemisphere for the next half century. Western North America was still largely a matter of frontiersmen and international politics. The spoils to be divided were the Spanish borderlands and the open spaces of the Great West and Northwest. It was an affair of all North America, not of any single nation. The outcome no one could predict, patriotic historians to the contrary notwithstanding.

In this elemental process of shaping national zones the two English speaking peoples moved westward side by side. In each there was a succession of frontier types. In both cases the vanguard were the fur men. The United States frontier nosed its way like a wedge between British America on the right flank and Spanish America on the left. Besides being the crux of international relations, both border zones were areas of cultural influence, quite as significant as that of the isolated frontier.

Into the Pacific Northwest, British and American fur men raced across the continent. These "splendid wayfarers" profited by the commerce in skins, marked out spheres of influence for their respective nations, prepared the way for fixing boundaries, and were harbingers of permanent civilization. The British traders moved west from two eastern bases, and represented principally two great organizations. The Hudson's Bay Company at first had held close to eastern shores. In the mid-eighteenth century it was forced inland by French rivalry in the back country and by criticism at home.[5] Then it found a rival in the St. Lawrence Valley. Scotch settlers entered the fur trade at Montreal, formed the Northwest Company, and pushed boldly west. Mackenzie, McGillivray, McDougal, and all the rest—they have been called the "Clan of the Macks". South of the Great Lakes they competed with

[5] It is interesting to note in passing that Samuel Hearne for the Hudson's Bay Company explored the copper mine country at the very same time that Daniel Boone reached the Mississippi. The two west moving columns were neck and neck.

American traders, and beyond the Mississippi they invaded the territory of Spain. In the Minnesota country and on the Missouri the Americans found them intrenched in the Louisiana Purchase. In the Canadian prairies the Nor'westers engaged in a life and death struggle with the Hudson's Bay Company. Rival posts were planted on every important stream. Price wars and bloodshed ensued, and tribal relations were sadly upset. But important explorations resulted; the Rocky Mountains were soon reached, and Mackenzie descended his fluvial namesake to the Arctic Ocean.

The next step was across the northern Rockies. Mackenzie again led the way and rivals followed. Spaniards from St. Louis ascended the Missouri, and Lewis and Clark crossed the mountains to the Lower Columbia. For the Nor'westers Fraser established posts in Fraser River Valley and David Thompson got a toe-hold on the upper Columbia in regions which are now British Columbia, Idaho, and Montana. Fraser's New Caledonia posts were the first permanent English speaking settlements on the Pacific Coast of America. Close behind the Nor'westers went Astor's men, and when Thompson descended the Columbia to its mouth he found Astoria established there. For the moment he was forestalled.

Then the American fur men had a setback. To them the War of 1812 was disastrous all along the border from Detroit to Astoria. Indians around the Lakes generally joined the British, and American traders fell back. Manuel Lisa and his associates retreated down the Missouri. Astoria was sold to the Nor'westers to prevent its capture by a British war vessel.

Canadian fur men were now confident. Why not restore the good old boundary of the Quebec Act, and extend it west? Urged by the traders, the British peace commissioners at Ghent proposed just this, demanding the cession of most of the country north of the Ohio, Missouri, and Platte rivers. The Oregon country was already in their hands. It would have been a pretty slice of territory. But quite the contrary happened, and the Canadians in turn got a setback. By the treaty British fur men were excluded from the United States, American traders replaced them around the Lakes, and the boundary was run along the forty-ninth parallel to the Rockies. Another great chapter in the story of the map was finished. As the Americans saw it, the shadow of Britain in the Upper Mississippi Valley had been removed. Canadians express it differently.

West of the Rockies the Canadians were still far ahead. Spain traded

her rights to Oregon for those to Texas and withdrew south to 42°. Then Mexico took Spain's place. England and the United States arranged for joint occupation of the Oregon country—a seven hundred mile stretch from California to 54° 40′. In that vast region the legal rights of the two nations were now equal. But *de facto* the advantage was clearly with the British, for the Astorians had sold out, and left the British in control. Nor'westers now consolidated with the Hudson's Bay Company, a western capital was placed at Ft. Vancouver,[6] and Dr. McLoughlin took charge. For nearly two decades now this white haired dictator controlled most of the fur business of the Pacific Northwest, all the way from San Francisco to Alaska and eastward to the Rockies. His counterpart at Sitka was Baránof. These two fur barons were the monarchs of all Northwest America.

The American fur men had better luck in Mexico. Forestalled by the British traders in the Oregon country, they pushed southwest and west across the Great Valley and into the Rockies. Everywhere west of Louisiana and south of 42° they were intruders on Mexican soil. Most of our American explorer heroes of the Far West, from Smith to Frémont, were in reality belated explorers of a foreign country. For a quarter century after 1820 these trespassers roamed the western wilds, profiting by the fur trade, and "discovering" the mountain passes—which Spaniards had discovered long before. Into the Great Basin they entered simultaneously by way of the Platte River and the Rio Grande.

These mountain men were exemplars of manifest destiny. They wandered through Mexican lands, sometimes with but more generally without permission, unconscious of their character as unwelcome intruders, or arrogantly resentful of dark skinned people who spoke a foreign tongue and disputed the "inalienable right" of Americans to do as they pleased. Most of the fur gatherers were restless adventure lovers—rolling stones who gathered no moss, nor can we say that they got a very fine polish in the process of rolling. But they were endowed with that physical energy, that fondness for a life of half savagery, and that detachment from locality which fitted them for the great task which Titanic nature had set for some one.

Below the impresario Americans, who as partners managed large affairs, and beside the rank and file of reckless Americans who went as hired men or free trappers, there were the more numerous French *engagés*. These hardy souls, half European, half Indian, still formed the backbone of the western fur trade both in Canada and the United States.

[6] Across the river from the site of the present city of Portland.

One such has given his name to Provo, another to Laramie, another to Pierre's Hole. Western Canada is similarly peppered with place-names commemorating the deeds of the French. These half-breeds did the humbler tasks of rowing, packing, skin curing, and camp duty. They served as guides into the wilderness, for their ancestors for generations had led the van, whether under English, French, Spanish, or American rule. Just as the American cowboy learned his trade from the Spanish *vaquero,* so the American fur trader borrowed his methods and his lingo from the French *métis. Bourgeois,* the word for manager, in the mouth of the mountain men became *bushwa,* for boss.

These American fur men were by no means monarchs of all they surveyed. In the southern Rockies and in the Great Basin they found Mexican traders everywhere ahead of them. They tried to push into jointly owned Oregon, but found their way blocked by the Hudson's Bay Company, safely intrenched in Snake River Valley. Climbing the Sierras, they descended the western slopes into California. There, in the Sacramento Valley, they found the streams trapped by Russians from Ft. Ross and by McLoughlin's brigades from Ft. Vancouver. A Hudson's Bay settlement encountered by the Americans in the valley, and for obvious reasons called by them French Camp, is still in existence near Stockton and still bears the same name.

The Americans had been beaten, not only to the Pacific Northwest, but to northern California as well. Both they and the men of H. B. C. were unwelcome trespassers on the soil of Mexico. The international contest was not yet over. The map was not yet made. The ultimate fate of the Far West was still in doubt. Spain was out, Russia had backed up to 54° 40′, but England, the United States, and Mexico still had their stake. When the Republic of Texas was created, it, too, developed ambitions for a frontage on the Pacific.

The uncertainty was removed by the settler. Fur men and Santa Fe trader were followed into the alluring regions by land hungry Americans. All that had gone before, all the colonial and international drama of the centuries, was the background into which fitted the relentless westward movement of the farmer frontier.

By 1820 the United States had achieved stability and confirmed its independence from Europe. The next two decades witnessed the rise of the great Middle West and the formation of a western democracy. It was a militant democracy, fully imbued with belief in manifest destiny. American institutions must embrace and regenerate the entire Western Hemisphere. A concrete application was to be found in the rich lands

of Mexico and the disputed Oregon country, just beyond. So the shadow of Europe in the West now gave way to the shadow of the United States in the West—a shadow which all America and several European nations watched with anxiety, for nearly half of the northern continent was still at stake. Impelled by this expansion urge, Anglo-Americans drove a wide salient between Canada and Mexico, checking the expansion of the one, and absorbing half the territory of the other. This madness for conquest has been called by our naughty neighbors "the other side of the Monroe Doctrine".

Mexico, in spite of her turmoil, likewise felt the impulse of expansion. Settlers poured into her northern provinces at a rate unprecedented under Spain. The vast "Spanish Grants", as they are erroneously called, in Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, and California, were nearly all made during the Mexican régime. Part of the new settlers were Mexicans; part were foreigners. Spain had colonized Florida and Louisiana with Anglo-Americans. Mexico now made the same political mistake in Texas, New Mexico, and California.

Many factors aroused American interest in the Far West. Boston coast traders, overland fur men, Northwestern missionaries, and official explorers had spied out the land. Interest was stimulated by sectional rivalry, and by fear of England, France, or Russia. Pathfinders beckoned; government tried to follow. By diplomacy, through purchase from Mexico, and through compromise with England it essayed to acquire all the vast region between Louisiana and the Pacific. Mexico did not wish to sell, and England was "stubborn"—so our schoolbooks say. Canning put his heavy foot down on the Columbia, and there he stood; so Uncle Sam resorted to watchful waiting. We thank President Wilson for the phrase, for it precisely fits the case. Wilkes, Ap Jones, Larkin, and Frémont all typify the government's hope that something would "turn up".

While government watched, settlers moved in. Invited, Americans colonized Texas, arose in revolt, and sought annexation, alternating this ambition with dreams of possessing "the fine harbor of Monterey". Covered wagons creaked their way from the Middle West to Oregon; then England and the United States divided the disputed area. Uninvited, and long before the Gold Rush, other covered wagons invaded California, still a part of Mexico; their occupants obtained generous land grants, and then, imitating the Texans, set up the Bear Flag Republic. When something thus turned up, Frémont was on hand. Uninvited, Mormons poured into Utah, also Mexican territory. Uncle

Sam's soldiers and diplomats now supplemented the work of the settlers. Texas was annexed; Mexico went to war, and was forced to yield half of her domain. The purchase of the Gadsden strip and of Alaska completed the story of Saxon growth on the western mainland. The contest for the continent was practically over.

This division of the western seaboard of North America was highly significant. It cut off from Spanish America the remaining borderland areas which had been only partly Hispanized and placed the boundary near the frontier of effective Spanish colonization. It gave both Canada and the United States frontage on the Pacific. It enabled them both to assimilate added millions of Europeans. Built on the national domain, in both countries the West became a powerful nationalizing force. The process of growth kept both nations young with continued frontier experience; it prolonged opportunity for social experimentation, and perpetuated early American and Canadian characteristics.

VI.

On this long colonial and international background the subsequent development of the Western Hemisphere was founded. The nations had come into being. The outline of the map had been essentially completed. The territorial bases for the national system had been laid. The next phase was the filling in of the spaces with people, national unification, and economic growth. Like all the earlier phases, this, too, was not confined to one American nation, but was hemisphere wide.

In this whole process of national growth and unification in the nineteenth century the outstanding factors were boundless natural resources, foreign immigration, foreign capital, and expanding markets. Without these, none of the American nations would have come far on the road which they have traveled. No time is left me for detail. I can only indicate the broad lines. But if you are like my students, I am sure you will gladly forgive me for what I leave out.

The United States first got under way. Here territorial expansion was attended by growing pains. Tariffs, the slavery question, the acquisition of Texas, Oregon, and California aroused sectional jealousies. For thirty years peace between the sections was maintained by compromise. War followed, but the Union was preserved. It was then multiplied in strength by the peopling of the Far West. Wide flung and sprawling, it was welded by the building of transcontinental railroads, the economic reconstruction of the South, and the reorganization of industry on a national scale. In all this, European immigration and

European capital played a decisive part. By the end of the nineteenth century both political and economic nationality had been achieved.

While the United States were gaining solidarity and power, the British provinces to the north were being similarly welded into a great dominion. The War of 1812 stimulated their sense of nationality, and British immigration lessened American influence. By 1850 the provinces had already won responsible government, but they were still detached entities. Like the United States, the Dominion was fashioned out of scraps of territory variously acquired.

Now the tide of federation set strongly in. Union was prompted by community of interests. Obstacles were met in local hostilities and racial suspicion. Federation found able champions and determined opponents. There were Hamiltons and Calhouns. In the Quebec Conference—as significant in Canadian history as the Constitutional Convention in the United States—the Dominion of Canada was born. One by one the older provinces joined. *A mari usque ad mare* became the slogan. Hudson's Bay Company relinquished its vast jurisdiction in the West, Manitoba and British Columbia entered the union, and the Dominion did indeed extend from sea to sea.

The loosely knit federation, like its neighbor a little earlier, was now welded by transcontinental railroads and the development of the West. The American movement to the frontier was duplicated in Canada. European capital furnished the means. European immigrants thronged, Americans flocked across the border, new prairie provinces were formed, Winnipeg and Vancouver became boom towns. New railroads built up still more northerly cities, and mining rushes developed the yet more remote Northwest. Like California, Oregon, and Washington, British Columbia looks out across the Pacific.

The World War stimulated Canadian loyalism on the one hand, and English conciliation on the other. Canada now has full membership in the British Commonwealth. A fine sentiment binds her to the empire, but she is in all essentials an independent nation. From pole to pole American independence from Europe has been achieved.

Hispanic America has a similar tale of national growth to tell. Some of our southern neighbors have been moving rapidly along the same road as that traveled by the Anglo-American nations. The last half century has been remarkable especially for the emergence of the A B C powers—Argentina, Brazil, and Chile.

The essential factors in the recent development of these countries are much the same as those which have operated in Canada and the

United States. Foreign capital and foreign immigration have been decisive. Italians, Spaniards, and Germans have come to the A B C countries by millions to make their homes. Railroads, plantations, stock ranches, nitrate works, mines, and oil wells have been developed by English and German capital. In business matters Uncle Sam has by no means had a monopoly there. Will Rogers, whom all will accept as an authority, wrote from Buenos Aires a few weeks ago, "Englishmen have got this country sewed up tighter than Borah has Idaho". Other indexes of material progress in that far Southland are the great modern cities, such as Santiago, Rio de Janeiro, and Sao Paulo. Cultural progress has followed material prosperity. Buenos Aires, with its nearly three million inhabitants, is the third city in the Western Hemisphere, and one of the great ones of the world. Brazil, with a population of over forty millions, is the second power in America, a title which Argentina probably would contest. When a Brazilian boasted of his country's forty-three millions, an Argentinian retorted, "You must have counted all those who live in the trees".

"The first shall be last!" In the tropics and around the shores of the Caribbean there has been less material progress than in the temperate regions. The areas which were most developed in early colonial days are now most retarded.[7] Nevertheless, backwardness is only relative, and some of these tropical regions, with their fruit and oil, have recently attracted capital and been developed at a tremendous rate.

Mexico, our nearest Hispanic neighbor, has continued to have its ups and downs. The fall of Maximilian was followed by the rule of one of the remarkable men of all time. Porfirio Díaz, half-breed Zapotec Indian, and soldier hero, became president on the platform of no reëlection —and then held office for seven terms in succession. He was a benevolent despot. He gave Mexico what it then most needed—good order and material progress. Foreign capital poured in, railroads were built, mines and oil wells opened. What had happened in the United States, Canada, and Brazil, was duplicated there. Díaz became a much eulogized world figure. Outsiders saw Mexico in a Golden Age.

But prosperity was one-sided. Vast estates were still intact while millions of people needed land. Foreigners and the old aristocracy flourished while peons were still bound to the soil. The kettle of unrest boiled, and the lid blew off. Madero gave the new *Grito,* Díaz fled the country never to return, Madero fell, Huerta was eliminated, Carranza put in power, and the new constitution installed. Socialistic and na-

[7] This is true of British, Dutch, and French America also.

tionalistic in its aims, fifteen years have been spent putting it into operation. The declared objectives of the social revolution—for it is still going on—are Mexico for Mexicans, rights for the common man, and education for the common people—slogans which sound familiar to Anglo-Americans. In so radical a program vested interests have suffered. In the struggle the Church has been involved. Critics maintain that some of the reforms are more apparent than real; but the same has been said of other countries.

VII.

Progress toward nationality in the Western Hemisphere has been attended by international adjustments. The interrelations of Canada and the United States have always been close, as their development has been in many ways parallel. Loyalists never forget their expulsion from the home hearth, nor the attempted conquest of 1812. Fortunately, as the Canadians say, the Americans were always just exasperating enough to prevent an international marriage, thus preserving Canadian nationality. By 1846 the old boundary questions had been adjusted. The mid-century was sometimes disturbed by annexation talk that was seldom dangerous. The war between the states and Fenian raids caused irritation. Fisheries and the Bering Sea were bones of contention. Blaine enjoyed twisting the British Lion's tail. Trade relations have sometimes been troublesome. But eventually these matters have been amicably settled. All in all, with common boundaries unfortified for more than a century, Canada and the United States, in this world of turmoil, furnish a splendid example of neighborliness.

Of the Hispanic republics the most intimate international contacts have been with each other. Like good Irishmen, whom they greatly resemble, the Latins quarrel among themselves but show solidarity against outsiders who interfere. Bullets often fly. But boundary disputes on many borders have been settled by arbitration, in which Latin America has set an example before the world. With Europe there has been occasional friction, but much more conspicuous has been the peaceful intercourse of commerce, investment, immigration, and cultural contacts.

Hispanic dealings with the United States have generally been closest in the adjacent regions; and by the rest of Latin America, naturally, these dealings have been taken as an index. Early friendship soon cooled. When the United States seized half of Mexico's domain, that country became embittered and other Latins suspicious. In the mid-

century relations with Mexico greatly improved, and the long reign of Díaz was the heyday of American investors south of the Rio Grande. After the fall of "El General", the story was one of frequent intervention. Huerta was eliminated and Carranza elevated largely through Wilson's aid. Villa chasing and "saluting the flag" made Uncle Sam ridiculous. Mexico's new constitution threatened American investments and a decade of irritation followed. But this matter has been adjusted. In recent years the United States has had its most intimate relations with the Isthmus and the Caribbean area. In these regions the United States has exercised extensive supervisory functions. With South America, on the other hand, the tendency is toward recognition of the fullest autonomy. There the Monroe Doctrine is dead. The Southern Continent has grown up.

The essential unity of the Western Hemisphere was revealed by the Great War. Every nation had to answer the question of participation or neutrality. Canada was in from the start; the United States moved more slowly. Until Uncle Sam joined the Allies, all Hispanic America held aloof. Then, of the twenty states to the south, eight joined the Allies, five broke relations with Germany, and seven remained neutral. It is a significant thing that all America, from the north pole to the south pole, was either on the same side of the great struggle or remained neutral. There was emphatic Western Hemisphere solidarity.

The Americas have developed side by side. In the past their relations have been close; in the future they may or may not be closer. In the colonial period Latin greatly outweighed Saxon America. In the nineteenth century the balance tipped decisively in the other direction. But it is swinging back. The importance of Hispanic America as an economic unit and as a political factor is becoming greater from day to day. It is one of the great reservoirs of raw materials. It continues to attract foreign capital and foreign immigration. Saxon America, with its one hundred and forty millions of people, is practically closed to European settlers. Hispanic America, with its hundred millions, is wide open. A German colony of a whole million is right now being planned for the Upper Amazon—equipped with electric cooling plants and everything else up to date. It is entirely possible that within a short time Hispanic will outnumber Saxon America, and with continued immigration its race stock will be more and more largely European. Ever since independence there has been fundamental Western Hemisphere solidarity. Therefore, it is not a matter of indifference to know that European influence in South America to-day far outweighs that of Saxon

America, and that Europe is bending every effort to draw the Southern continent more and more into the European circle and away from its northern neighbors.

VIII.

In this imperfect way I have endeavored to indicate some of the larger historical unities and interrelations of the Americas. Those outlined are only a few out of the many that are patent at every turn. Cultural and intellectual relations are quite as close and fully as important as political, territorial, and economic contacts. What I have said is intended merely as an illustration.

In recent years the range of investigation in Western Hemisphere history has vastly broadened. This is due in no small part to the influence of Jameson's guides to foreign archives; to the work of American and Canadian scholars on British America; of the students of the Caribbean; of the historians of the frontier; of the whole galaxy of Hispanists; of the social, economic, institutional, cultural, and diplomatic historians, the international relationists, and a host of others. Our historical data have not only become greater in amount but much more complex in character. Phases and factors formerly undreamed of have come to light. Many of the new discoveries do not fit into the nationalistic pattern. In the old synthesis their significance is lost. In a larger framework, on the other hand, many things which have seemed obscure and secondary become outstanding and primary.

This applies especially to borderland researches. Brebner studied the institutional relations of New England and the Maritime Provinces of Canada, and concluded that the histories of Canada and the United States should be treated as one. Just as emphatically, those who have studied borderland areas between Saxon and Hispanic America are convinced that the two fields are inextricably linked together. Borderland zones are vital not only in the determination of international relations, but also in the development of culture. In this direction one of the important modifications of the Turner thesis is to be sought. By borderland areas not solely geographical regions are meant; borderline studies of many kinds are similarly fruitful.

It is not merely that a new framework will find a place for special researches that have already been consummated. Quite as important, a larger framework will call for data which we do not possess, and thus suggest a thousand new things to do. A classic example of the influence of a new synthesis is found in the multitude of investigators whom

Turner set to work to fill out his elementary sketch. A report by a recent committee of historians complains that many doctoral thesis subjects in United States history have been cultivated past the point of diminishing returns. A larger synthesis of American history, I am sure, would do much to relieve this rather pathetic situation.[8] Who has written the history of the introduction of European plants and animals into the Western Hemisphere as a whole, or of the spread of cattle and horse raising from Patagonia to Labrador? Who has written on a Western Hemisphere scale the history of shipbuilding and commerce, mining, Christian missions, Indian policies, slavery and emancipation, constitutional development, arbitration, the effects of the Indian on European cultures, the rise of the common man, art, architecture, literature, or science? Who has tried to state the significance of the frontier in terms of the Americas?

A noted historian has written for us the *Epic of America.* In his title "America" means the United States. We need an Adams to sketch the high lights and the significant developments of the Western Hemisphere as a whole. Perhaps the person who undertakes the task, as a guarantee of objectivity ought to be an inhabitant of the moon. But such a synthesis, done with similar brilliancy, would give us the "Epic of *Greater* America".

HERBERT E. BOLTON.

The University of California.

[8] Before closing I wish to repeat with emphasis that I do not propose such a synthesis as a substitute for, but as a setting in which to place, any one of our national histories.

THE FORMATION OF THE NEW EAST INDIA COMPANY OF CALONNE[1]

THE problem of the Old Régime in France has been much confused for historians by the melodramatic intensity of the Revolution. The genius of Tocqueville and of Taine and the something less than genius of Augustin Cochin and the conspiracy school, not to mention the picaresque appeal of the memoir writers, have imposed upon the present a concept of the Old Régime as a political society existing solely as a foil for the catastrophes and terrors, the achievements and accomplishments of those awful and glorious years after 1789. The miseries of the peasants, the rationalizations of the philosophers, the scandals of high life—these are the steps which in spite of well-known criticism, constitute the approach to the Revolution. Meanwhile, a simple *a posteriori* logic dictates another approach. It was the bourgeois, the capitalist, the entrepreneur who emerged victorious from the mêlée of the Revolution. Crane Brinton has shown us in *The Jacobins* that the bourgeois made the Revolution. The question emerges, major in significance but almost wholly unanswered: What was their political weight and action before 1789?

A part of the answer to that question is to be found in the hitherto untold story of the formation of the new India company.[2] As it unfolds, it will be apparent that Sieyès's estimate of the third estate as "nothing", however valuable as material for a pamphlet and as the basis of a reputation, was far from even the ambiguous accuracy of a real oracle. Quite probably the oracular abbé did not recognize that aspect of the third estate which we know as "big business"; he was to encounter it in unmistakable form before another decade had passed. It will be seen that even in 1785 "big business" was able to "excite the zeal of too many people attached to the ministries" to permit a practical politician to resist its demands. It will also be seen that the passion for profit liquidated old

[1] Based on research supported by a grant-in-aid of the Social Science Research Council and the University of Wyoming.

[2] Summaries of the external facts of the company's history, with no comprehension of the forces back of its formation or of the hostility it engendered, will be found in E. Levasseur, *Histoire des Classes Ouvrières et de l'Industrie en France avant 1789*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (1900–1901); in his *Histoire du Commerce de la France*, vol. I. (1911–1912); and in H. Weber, *La Compagnie Française des Indes* (1904).

political jealousies and regimented rival powers in the service of the London and Paris bankers.

The dissolution of the East India Company in 1769 and the consequent abandonment of the India trade to the efforts of individual merchants was not generally regarded as final or satisfactory. The estates of Brittany in 1770 petitioned for the reëstablishment of the company.[3] About the same time, the Anglo-French financiers, such as Bourdieu and Chollet, of London, and Jacques Necker, as yet only a prominent member of the Thelusson firm, were negotiating with a view to finding some basis of coöperation between a reconstituted French company and the English East India Company. In 1772, Bourdieu was counting on renewing the negotiations. Although Bourdieu's proposals were not favorably regarded in the ministry,[4] the political aspects and possibilities of the trade continued to interest the government. The requirement to deliver all India goods at Lorient for sale at the biennial auctions was rigorously maintained in spite of the sustained demand of the other ports and of the deputies of commerce that the returns should be permitted at least to the home ports. In 1771, Trudaine declared that "it was essential to present a national front to foreigners by combining all sales at one time and place".[5]

Many asserted that free trade failed adequately to supply the French market. A group of three retired *juges-consuls* of Lorient declared to Vergennes that attempts of individuals to trade in India had been ruinous to those undertaking it.[6] Later when the new company was under fire, the administrators argued repeatedly that free trade had been inadequate and that what there was had passed largely into the hands of foreigners, especially at Marseilles, where the practice of lending the names of French firms to foreigners had become habitual. Even a very ardent advocate of freedom of trade, one of the deputies extraordinary sent to Paris to secure the revocation of the monopolistic privilege of the company, was able to present only a very mediocre statistical picture of free trade. His figures showed an average of twenty-one vessels a year

[3] Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Asie, vol. 5.

[4] Bourdieu to Aiguillon, Nov. 24, 1772, *ibid.*, Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 499. Office memoir of June 16, 1773, unsigned, *ibid.*, vol. 502.

[5] Arch. Départmentales, Charente Inférieure, E 1198. For a demand by the chamber of commerce of Bordeaux in 1775 for "liberté des retours de l'Inde", see the archives of the chamber at Bordeaux, C 4257. The many references to these archives throughout this paper are all derived from the magnificent *Inventaire du Fonds de la Chambre de Commerce de Guienne*, by J. A. Brutails (1893).

[6] "Considerations sur le commerce de l'Inde et necessité absolue pour son maintien d'en faire l'exploitation par l'entremise d'une compagnie." (Signed) Godieu, De Montigny de Monplaisir, J-L. Borne-Bonet, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 550.

for the entire period, 1769 to 1785, and even for the especially prosperous period just before the American war, 1774 to 1777, an average of only twenty-nine vessels a year.[7]

It must, of course, be borne in mind that the spirit of enterprise was not as general or as adaptable in the eighteenth century as it is in present-day commercial society. The attempts of Castries to interest the business men of the ports in the very great possibilities of the trade of the American states after 1783 or even in the immensely profitable business of supplying the French West Indies were quite without success. When, in 1775, Sartine gave the seaport towns the opportunity to show that they could supply the West Indies and thus avoid a second revision of the cherished *pacte colonial,* the chamber of commerce of Bordeaux publicly appealed to the merchants to do something to meet Sartine's conditions. The appeal seems to have been without result.[8]

In spite, then, of the attractive profits of the East India trade, ranging from forty to eighty per cent. on each turnover of from eighteen to twenty-four months,[9] it is at least possible to believe that private enterprise might fall short of furnishing the French market with supplies of Eastern goods equal to the demand.

The conclusion of the negotiations for peace with Great Britain paved the way for the reorganization of the relations of France with India. The first problem to solve was the serious shortage of Eastern goods resulting from the long continuation of the war. Without waiting to settle the matter of policy, the government intervened directly to meet the apparently serious emergency. By an *arrêt* of February 2, 1783, Grandclos-Meslé, who had been connected with the administration of the old company, was directed to send four *flûtes* to China on the king's account to buy Nanking silks. The operation seems to have been pushed through with great dispatch. Job-hunters and merchants with cloth to sell found themselves too late with their applications to Grandclos-Meslé. The operations in China were completed on January 4, 1784, the first cargoes were reported on May 24, 1784, and, after one postponement, the auction at Lorient was held on August 23, 1784.[10]

[7] *Mémoires Relatifs à la Discussion du Privilège de la Nouvelle Compagnie des Indes* (1787), pp. 18, 27, 29.

[8] Nussbaum, The French Colonial Arrêt of August 30, 1784, *South Atlantic Quarterly,* XXVII. (1928) 62–78. Arch., Bordeaux, C 4257, May 15, 1776.

[9] *Mémoires Relatifs à la Discussion du Privilège de la Nouvelle Compagnie des Indes, passim.*

[10] De Montigny du Timeur to the President Joly de Fleury, Feb. 9, 27, 1783, Bib. Nat., collection Joly de Fleury, vol. 1722; L. Pinel, Carcassonne, to Vergennes, Aug. 11, 1783, Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et. Doc., Asie, vol. 18; *ibid., passim,* for reports of Grandclos-Meslé.

The government, however, had no intention of carrying this direct intervention beyond the emergency. Some one evolved the idea of organizing the merchants of the several ports through their chambers of commerce into an association for the specific purpose of carrying through one expedition to China.[11] The *arrêt* of July 21, 1783, directed the formation of *une seule et même association* among the merchants of Marseilles, Bordeaux, Nantes, Saint-Malo, Lorient, and Havre. The association was to have a capital of 6,000,000 livres, divided into 1200 shares of 5000 livres each. Four hundred shares were assigned to Marseilles, three hundred and twenty to Bordeaux, one hundred and forty to Nantes, and lesser quotas to the other ports. At each of the three larger centers, the shareholders were to elect one director. The king offered three of his vessels but the association was to pay all the expenses of the operation.

The plan seems to have approximated very closely the limit of the practical interest of the merchants of these places in the India trade. The quota assigned to Bordeaux was covered at once and more would have been taken. At Nantes and the other northern ports, there seems to have been no difficulty, but at Marseilles, the 2,000,000 livres required were raised only after urgent persuasion on the part of Rostagny, the deputy of Marseilles at the bureau of commerce.[12] At Nantes, De Luynes was elected deputy, or, as we should say, director, at Bordeaux, Nairac, and at Marseilles, Miraillect.

The organization did not work smoothly. The stockholders were suspicious of the directors, the controllers general intervened, the association refused to do anything that had not been directed by the government, the directors got into a bitter law suit over a petty amount of money.[13] Nevertheless, the expedition prospered. On February 12, 1784, Nairac announced the departure of the three vessels, *Le Triton, Le Sagittaire,* and *La Provence,* which the king had furnished.[14] Nairac's account of their outward cargoes illustrates in a striking manner how the Eastern trade drained Europe of specie, for over seventy-five per cent.

[11] Among the numerous memorialists who presented plans, only Bedos, the author of *Le Négociant Patriote* (1784), suggested that the trade should be entrusted to the chambers of commerce. "Nous avons tous un intérêt", he wrote; "seroit-il impossible, Monseigneur, de le diriger à la Patrie?" Bedos to Vergennes, Jan. 4, 1784, *ibid.*

[12] Chamber of Bordeaux to the controller general, Aug. 12, 1783, Arch. Bordeaux, C 4265. Joseph Fournier, *La Chambre de Commerce de Marseille et ses Représentants Permanents à Paris* (1920), p. 157.

[13] See especially Arch., Nantes, C 591 and C 624 (2), and Arch. Nat., F^{12} 724.

[14] Texier, *Histoire de la Chambre de Commerce de Bordeaux,* p. 34.

of the value of these cargoes was in specie or instruments of exchange.[15]

The returns proved to be very satisfactory. The sale of tea alone surpassed expectations by more than 1,500,000 livres. Although some silk and silk stuffs remained unsold when dividends were declared, there was a profit of 4,930,000 livres, or about eighty-two per cent.[16]

The deputy of Marseilles, Miraillect, left the sale at Lorient entirely in the hands of Nairac and De Luynes. The final liquidation was entrusted to Nairac's banking house, P. Nairac and Son. Nairac attempted to deduct interest on a portion of Marseilles's share in the enterprise on account of a delay in the delivery of the funds subscribed. The result was a lawsuit over a fraction of one per cent. of the returns, which Nairac, in spite of repeated rebuffs in the lower courts, carried up to the council and managed to keep alive at least until 1789.[17]

Although no document summarizing the results of this experiment from the government's point of view has been found, it is obvious that certain conclusions could hardly have been avoided. It was apparent that the merchants of the seaport towns had too much local and personal jealousy, too little coöperative habit, to develop a financial organization that could face the English company on anything approaching an equal basis. They had manifested no disposition to work for the continuance, not to speak of the extension, of the activity of their association or of the Eastern trade.[18] Continuity and expansion would have to depend upon repeated and persistent efforts on the part of the government. On the other hand, nothing could be hoped from the association that would contribute to the political advancement of France in the Orient. China was an excellent source of silk, tea, and profits, but it was not, as yet, an area in which political weight could be developed.

15 The directors of commerce of Guienne to Vergennes, Bordeaux, May 21, 1785. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Asie, vol. 18. Compte général de l'emploi fait de la somme de six millions, Arch., Chambre de Commerce de Nantes, C 749.

16 Nairac to the chamber of Bordeaux, Oct. 21, 1785, Arch. of the chamber, C 4353. For further information upon the final settlement, see minutes of the *juges-consuls* of Nantes, Arch., Nantes, C 591; Bordeaux, C 4258. Letter of De Luynes to the *juges-consuls* of Nantes, Nov. 27, 1785, Arch., Nantes, C 749. The calculation of the profit is based on the customary sale of 1/10% of the gross returns for the benefit of the poor. This amounted to 10,930 livres, which indicates a profit of 4,930,000 livres, or about eighty-two per cent. On the other hand, Nantes received of this sum 1000 livres, 2 sous, 6 deniers and Bordeaux, 2286 livres, which, on the same basis, indicates a profit of forty-three per cent. The discrepancy is presumably due to deductions for expenses of the sale at Lorient.

17 Arch. Nat., F^{12} 724; minutes of the *juges-consuls* of Nantes, Arch., Nantes, C 591.

18 Proposals of De Montigny du Timeur with reference to such development were filed in the Nantes archives with the comment, "sans réponse ni en faire mention sur les registres", *ibid.*, C 624 (2).

Meanwhile, the logic of political animus, of economic statesmanship, of capitalistic enterprise, in complex combination, was leading the French government inexorably toward the recreation of monopoly in the Eastern trade. Vergennes had already learned from the veteran Montaran that the establishments of foreign trade concerned his department because they were closely connected with the political weight of the foreign powers with which he had to deal, as well as of France.[19] For Calonne, India was another opportunity to link the finances of the kingdom with the financiers of a new and bolder stamp who were displacing the plethoric and reactionary "Farmers" as the leaders of finance—the capitalistic profit-seekers as against the publicans. For Castries, the redevelopment of the India trade promised an enlargement of the colonial phase, so long diminished, of his ministry. All three of these ministers had a part in the formation of the new India company.[20] If Calonne's part was greatest, the superior preservation of the records of the foreign office makes it possible to state most fully the point of view of Vergennes.

The peace of 1783 seemed to be definitive and of such a character that France might build upon it with some hope of realizing "a place in the sun" appropriate to her history. The alliance with Holland and the projected commercial treaty with Russia opened the way to the north even if the Bordeaux shippers did not think the moderate profits of the trade worth their while.[21] The intimacies of the Family Alliance had been intensified by the war and seemed to offer large vistas in South America and even across the Pacific, where Mexican dollars, with an extra profit of thirty per cent., might shorten the physically longer route into the East—Rayneval's favorite project.[22] Disillusionment had not yet come in regard to the former colonies of Great Britain in North America, now open to the trade of the world and supposedly inclined by gratitude and affection toward France. The Treaty of Versailles provided for the restoration of French rights in India and also for certain

[19] Montaran to Vergennes, June 19, 1780, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 533.

[20] Joly de Fleury, when controller general, had made the first definite proposal. With characteristic lack of originality, he proposed to reëstablish something very like the old company, a group of *intéressés* under complete bureaucratic control. Every decision was to be subject to the approval of the ministers. His plan was totally disregarded in the actual development of the new company. Joly de Fleury to Vergennes, Feb. 12, 1783, *ibid.*, Mém. et Doc., Asie, vol. 18.

[21] Chamber of Commerce of Guienne to Letellier, Jan. 5, 1788, Arch., Bordeaux, C 4266.

[22] *Cf.* Rayneval's memoir of Jan., 1786, Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Asie, supplément, vol. 5. The memoir is more fully discussed below, p. 491.

special facilities to be furnished by the English company to French subjects whether they carried on trade "individually or as a company". In such a world, there was reason to hope that a careful policy might make France again a great power in India.

With this objective in mind, Vergennes's advisers, volunteer and official, were busy during 1783 and 1784 furnishing him with all sorts of ideas about India. A brief summary of the numerous memoirs addressed to him will indicate the general form of the problem and some of the particular considerations that seem to have entered into his later action and attitudes. As Rayneval remarked in 1786, the ultimate justification for the organization of a monopolistic company was political. The fact that the English power in India had grown and was growing dictated such an attitude.[23] Panchaud, the Genevese director of the Caisse d'Escompte, submitted to Joly de Fleury a memoir which Moracin, who later resided at Pondicherry for the new company, described to Vergennes as "containing all that can be said on the reëstablishment of our nation in that country".[24] Panchaud seems, indeed, to have had an exceptionally clear conception of the necessities of the situation. He saw that it was necessary to deal with the great financiers—"concentrate the organization around Paris", as he put it—and so secure an adequate capital. He proposed the organization of a negotiable share company, now a familiar form but then essentially a novelty. By the sale of shares and bonds this company should raise a capital of 60,000,000 livres. Thus adequately financed, the company should be given a monopoly, but should operate in India as a purely commercial company, "without touching the English". The treaty rights in the English ports, especially Calcutta, should be exploited to the full. Pondicherry and a new port to be obtained on the Malabar coast were also to be used. The company should be entirely devoid of political function.[25] The later history of the company fully demonstrated the good sense of Panchaud's program. Timidity and unfamiliarity with the possibilities of capital concentration by means of the sale of stock led to the decision to attempt organization on the basis of an issue of twenty million francs instead of sixty million. This deficient capitalization forced the new company to depend on the English company.

De Luynes, the deputy of the Nantes group in the association for the expedition to China, declared that a monopoly was dictated by the nature

[23] See also unsigned memoir, possibly Rayneval's, dated Apr., 1783, *ibid.*

[24] Moracin to Vergennes, Feb. 12, 1783, *ibid.*

[25] Réflexions générales sur les possessions et le commerce des Européens dans la péninsule de l'Inde, *ibid.*, vol. 4.

of the trade and, like Panchaud, urged that it should take the form of a stock company rather than that of a closed group of *intéressés*. He made the point that the intermediary between the company and the government should not be connected solely with the department of finance but also with the other departments concerned.[26] Gourlade, who was very close to Vergennes, argued that the Eastern trade was positively injurious to France since it extracted specie and competed with French industry and that therefore it should be limited, by means of a monopoly, to five ships a year, two of which should go to China.[27] Dupont de Nemours, who in this matter as in connection with the tobacco trade [28] expressed himself more freely to Vergennes than to his proper chief, the controller general, repeated the plan which he had advocated in 1767 and 1769. He proposed that the Ile de France and the Ile de Bourbon be opened as free ports to all the word, beginning with the United States, and a *messagerie* be created with ships of the king. This would accomplish, he declared, all the really desirable results, an adequate supply of Indian goods for French industry, and plentiful occupation for French carriers.[29]

It was generally agreed, except by such purely economic thinkers as Dupont, that a strongly organized representation of French commerce, that is to say, a company, must be visible in India. The new company, unlike the old, was to be purely commercial and devoid of any political functions. A political company would sooner or later involve war, which was to be avoided at all costs. From Vergennes's point of view, peace, the protection of existing and prospective treaties, were essential to any project to rehabilitate France.[30]

The pacific bases of Vergennes's policy, however, did not in his mind exclude the organization of the potential allies of France in India. In

[26] Undated memoir (copy) in the archives of the chamber of Nantes.

[27] Gourlade to Vergennes, Feb. 3, 1783, Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Asie, vol. 4. Several other unsigned memoirs which seem to be from Gourlade repeat the same idea. See also, Gourlade to Rayneval, Jan. 22, 1786: "Never would I allow myself to do anything contrary to his [Vergennes's] system", *ibid.*, suppl., vol. 5.

[28] Nussbaum, The Revolutionary Vergennes and Lafayette versus the Farmers General, *Journal of Modern History*, III. (1931) 592–604.

[29] Dupont to Vergennes, Oct. 28, 1784, Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Asie, vol. 4. See also Dupont's letter of Dec. 29, 1784. For the original proposal see Dupont's *Du Commerce et de la Compagnie des Indes* (2nd ed., Amsterdam, 1769).

[30] The completely pacific intention of Vergennes was most fully manifested in the promptness with which he met Lord Howe's proposal for total naval disarmament in the Indian area. For this interesting negotiation, which proceeded with almost no difficulty from either side, see Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vols. 549, 550, 551. Mr. J. Holland Rose in *William Pitt and the National Revival* (1911), p. 341, incorrectly leaves the impression that Vergennes rejected the proposal definitively on Apr. 1, 1786.

1786, Louis Monneron was sent to Tippoo to offer to share the expenses of the Mysore war, and, although Tippoo declined the offer on the ground that the effort against the English had been mutual, he did everything he could to show his friendship for the French. In 1784, Gourlade had urged keeping up the political connection with Hyder Ali and the Mahrattas. Even a proposal to intervene in Cochin China and to restore a deposed emperor, whose son and heir the bishop of Adran had brought to France, was given serious consideration. A treaty providing for the restoration of the deposed king and the grant to the French of two island posts was actually executed.[31]

It was, however, neither the projects of the economists nor the ambitions of the politicians that determined the ultimate formation of the new *Compagnie des Indes*. It was the well-coördinated effort and influence of the Paris bankers, Girardot, Haller, and Company, and of the London bankers, Bourdieu and Chollet, as leaders of a group of financiers. The firm of Bourdieu and Chollet had for a long time been involved with the French government in affairs that were none too creditable to either. In 1784, Bourdieu was trying to collect a considerable sum (350,000 livres) remaining due to the firm as a result of the unsavory stock-gambling operations of the Comte de Guines while he was ambassador at London in 1770.[32] Although Vergennes in 1777 had flatly refused to have anything more to do with Bourdieu's alleged claim, Calonne had resumed dealings with him. From the beginning of Calonne's ministry, he was in touch with Bourdieu and in the spring of 1784 was in direct correspondence with him.[33]

Bourdieu, meanwhile, had established relations with Girardot, Haller, and Company, and, in accord with them, had returned to the project of a new French India company about which he had dealt with Necker in 1770 and 1772. The plan of the two banking houses was quite simple. A French company should be formed with an exclusive privilege and

[31] Nov. 28, 1787, A. J. H. Clercq, *Recueil des Traités de la France*, XV. (suppl. 1713–1885) 133. *Cf.* memoir of La Luzerne, Arch. des Col., F^{3} 158.

[32] Guines had attempted a *coup*, failed, and refused to pay. Bourdieu and Chollet, his brokers, and Tort, his secretary, upon whom he threw the responsibility, were permitted by Aiguillon, then minister of foreign affairs, to sue him in the Châtelet, but the Guines faction secured Aiguillon's dismissal. When Maurepas came in, he wished to restore Aiguillon, who was his nephew, but time was necessary. Vergennes was put in as a stop-gap, but with great ingenuity managed to have the Châtelet give Guines a verdict against Tort, thus securing his own position. Bourdieu resorted to a sort of blackmail, threatening to publish all the papers. Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vols. 498–524, *passim*.

[33] Exposé des services de M. Bourdieu. Arch. Nat., T 38$^{1-2}$ (papiers de Huber).

with authority to make a "treaty" with the English company to purchase Indian goods from it rather than from the natives of India. According to Bourdieu, they began their operations by securing the support of Castries, the minister of the marine. Four of the promoters, Bernier, Sabatier, Desprez, and Périer, went to London in the spring of 1784 and told Bourdieu that under the auspices of Castries they and their associates proposed to ask for the sort of privilege he had had in mind. Bourdieu was given the authority of Castries to sound out the directors of the English company and the English ministry. He promptly sent a memoir to the Duke of Portland and to the directors. His arguments were designed to appeal to English interests but certainly not to come to the notice of Vergennes as they did. He argued, in brief, that a connection of the French company with the English company would serve to prevent the French from making direct connections in India, would produce about thirteen million pounds sterling of new business for the English company, and would lead the Indian manufacturers to regard the French only as the agents of the English.[34]

At this point, Calonne sent Tort to London to promise Bourdieu that the old claims on account of the Guines affair would be paid if his firm would help Tort float a loan in Belgium and would use its influence with the British government in favor of the formation of a new India company in France.[35] Whether this move of Calonne's was without knowledge of Castries's earlier movement or whether Castries knew of Calonne's cannot be determined. At any rate, from that time on, the proposal advanced under the auspices of Calonne.

A conference between Bourdieu and Calonne seems to have resulted in a satisfactory understanding. Calonne wrote Bourdieu a letter taking official note of his negotiations "to facilitate French commerce in India" and to express the king's satisfaction with the steps he had taken and with the services he had previously rendered—in short, to give him the character of an authorized negotiator.[36]

[34] Adhemar to Vergennes, Aug. 15, 1784, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 549.

[35] Memoir of Tort, dated Oct. 6, 1791, Arch. Nat., T 38[172]. This memoir was Tort's side of a dispute between him and Bourdieu as to the value of Tort's services in collecting the Guines debt. They were submitting it to the arbitration of their friends, including Hu[illegible]er.

[36] Calonne to Bourdieu, Apr. 26, 1784. Quoted in full by Bourdieu in the *Exposé* of his services in the formation of the company, which he prepared as material for his agent in Paris to use to convince the directors that his house ought to have all the commissions connected with their business and not to have to divide them with other firms. "The services previously rendered" by Bourdieu consisted of securing, at the request of

That Vergennes knew of these maneuvers in their first stages seems unlikely. He soon was well informed by Adhemar, Gourlade, and Barthélemy. By devious means, Adhemar obtained a copy of Bourdieu's memoir to the court of directors of the English company and transmitted it to Vergennes. "You will, of course, know of this", he wrote, "as the controller general would not have taken such a step without informing the council."[37] Vergennes did not inform Adhemar whether he knew of the matter or not, nor did he reply to Adhemar's complaint that he had been left in the dark as to the negotiations, but simply expressed his interest in his information and opinions on the India question. Bourdieu alleged that Vergennes as well as Calonne requested him to find out what the disposition of the new Pitt ministry would be. Gourlade knew very well what Bourdieu was doing and the state of his maneuvers, and Barthélemy warned Vergennes of Bourdieu's reputation. "He will be distrusted by you and the controller general, as he is distrusted here."[38]

Bourdieu succeeded in inducing the court of directors, with the approval of Pitt, to adopt a formal resolution on October 1, 1784, that they would treat, on bases not definitely formulated, "with any person having sufficient authority from a minister of France or from a French East India company".[39] They refused, however, to regard Calonne's letter of April 26, 1784, as authority to proceed, and Bourdieu went to Paris to ask for proper authority. Calonne held back on the ground that no company had as yet been formed, but promised that if the formation of the company were accomplished, the offer of the English court of directors would receive consideration. He formally conveyed once more the royal approval of Bourdieu's activities and gave a promise, not too vague, of a profitable connection with the company for Bourdieu's firm.[40] At this point, the negotiation of the treaty rested until the formation of the company.

Meanwhile, the formation of the company proceeded apace. It was known at Nantes in December, 1784, that the government was planning a stock company in which any merchant might participate, and De

Gourlade, letters of recommendation for agents of the promoters of the French company to Sir J. Macpherson, governor general of Bengal (*Exposé*). In a letter to Vergennes, dated June 3, 1786, Bourdieu asserted that he had done this at the request of Vergennes himself, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 556.

[37] Adhemar to Vergennes, July 9, 1784, *ibid.*, vol. 549.

[38] *Exposé.* Unsigned letter to Vergennes, Sept. 3, 1784, Arch Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 550. Barthélemy to Vergennes, Oct. 12, 1784, *ibid.*, vol. 549.

[39] *Exposé. Cf.* copy of resolution with Bourdieu, Chollet, and Bourdieu to B. Huber, Jan. 14, 1791, Arch. Nat., T 38^{1-2}.

[40] Calonne to Bourdieu, Dec. 1, 1784, quoted in *Exposé.*

Luynes informed Castries that he was authorized to take up any shares allotted to the towns he represented in the association for the expedition to China. Dupont was continuing to urge Vergennes to oppose the plan of Girardot, Haller, and Company on the ground that the English alone would profit,[41] but, according to Gourlade, Vergennes was in a pessimistic mood: "Vous m'avez persuadé", he said to Gourlade, "mais il est impossible de faire le bien dans ce pays. On veut une compagnie des Indes et elle sera établie malgré la démonstration phisique que vous m'avez donné de son danger." In the euphemistic phraseology of Adhemar, the great interests of the house of Girardot, Haller, and Company had been able to excite the zeal of too many people attached to the ministries.[42]

The proposed organization was taken up in a meeting of the council on February 27, 1785. It was presented by Calonne. Breteuil later alleged that Calonne had said in full council that he was proposing the formation of the company with the approval of commerce and only after having consulted all the chambers of commerce. This, of course, was not exactly true, although he had let it be known among their deputies and such deputies extraordinary as were in Paris to protest against the colonial *arrêt* of August 30, 1784.[43] The general plan of the organization was approved, including, according to the administrators, permission to make such arrangements with foreign companies as would be thought suitable and, specifically, provision that the company should be compensated for its losses if an agreement could not be reached with the English company. On the other hand, Vergennes a few weeks later wrote to Adhemar [44] that it would be financially and politically a mistake to depend on the English company. No such system, he asserted, had been adopted in the council, but the French company was to use the services of the English company only until its own trading posts were

[41] J. B. Baluynes to the *juges-consuls* of Nantes, "18 ou 19 Xbre 1784" [*sic*], Arch., Nantes, C 624. De Luynes to the *juges-consuls*, Dec. 29, 1784, *ibid.*, C 749; Dupont to Vergennes, Dec. 29, 1784.

[42] Gourlade to Tallien, undated [An V.], copy with memoir of Gourlade to Delacroix, Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Angleterre, vol. 18. Adhemar to Vergennes, Aug. 15, 1784, *ibid.*, Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 549.

[43] Memoir of the administrators of the company, Dec. 21, 1785, *ibid.*, Mém. et Doc., Asie, suppl., vol. 5. Letellier to the Chamber of Commerce of Guienne, Sept. 30, 1787, Arch., Bordeaux, C 4358. *Cf.* J.-B. Baluynes to *juges-consuls* of Nantes, Dec. 18 (19), 1784, cited above.

[44] Memoir of the administrators, Dec. 21, 1785, cited above. See also articles 6 and 7 of the *arrêt* of June 19, 1785, homologating the statutes and regulations of the company, which are to the same effect. Vergennes to Adhemar, Mar. 15, 1785, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. Pol., Angleterre, vol. 549.

reëstablished. Vergennes might be suspected on occasion of not speaking clearly, but it is difficult to believe that he did not hear clearly in a matter that was so seriously regarded by his closest friends and advisers. It is possible to suspect at this point, as M. Mathiez has shown at a later stage in the history of the company, the falsification of a decree.[45] On the other hand, it is quite possible that Vergennes was disingenuous in making this comment. As far as the records and assertions of others show, such a system had been adopted in council, with a provision for termination when the French *comptoirs* had been reëstablished.

No provision was made for the allocation of the shares among the commercial interests of the nation, particularly, as might have been expected, among the chambers of commerce that were participating in the China expedition. The Lorient merchants in a petition of 1785 refer to the company "à laquelle n'ont été appellés aucunes des villes maritimes et de manufactures". The chamber of Bordeaux complained to their deputy that "as soon as the stock appeared, all of it was snapped up by the speculators and none reserved for the maritime towns which coöperated in the association of 1783. When subscriptions were offered, the would-be subscribers were informed by the administrators that the shares had risen, six, seven, and eight per cent." [46]—apparently in the minds of the Bordelais a conclusive argument against purchasing. It is, however, to be remembered that Gourlade did not suppose it possible that so large a share issue could be floated.[47] It may well be that it was assumed that there would be plenty of shares for all takers.

The decisions of February 27 were embodied and the organization of the company completed in a series of *arrêts* of later dates. An *arrêt* of April 14, 1785, defined the general status of the company and the lines of its organization. It was authorized as a negotiable share company, with a capital of 20,000,000 livres and was granted the monoply of the trade beyond the Cape of Good Hope in terms only slightly different from that of the old company, for a period of seven years of peace. Model provisions, from the point of view of the present day, provided for the accountability of the administration to the stockholders. Girardot, Haller, and Company were provisionally named cashiers at Paris and J. J. Bérard and Company, at Lorient. Two other *arrêts* of May 15 named the officials. Tavernier de Boullongne, son of a former controller general and member of the councils of finance and of commerce,

[45] A. Mathiez, *Un Procès de Corruption sous la Terreur: l'Affaire de la Compagnie des Indes* (1920).

[46] Arch. Nat., F^4 1032^1. Arch., Bordeaux, C 4266, dated May 28, 1785.

[47] Gourlade to Tallien [An V.], cited above.

was made commissioner of the government. Gourlade, Bérard *aîné*, Périer, Bernier, Bézard, De Mars, Dodun, the firm Sabatier and Desprez, Montessuy, Bérard *cadet*, Moracin, and Goguenot were named administrators. Bernier, Sabatier, Desprez, and Périer were the four who had secured the coöperation of Bourdieu and Chollet. The Bérards were hostile to Bourdieu but were close to Vergennes.[48] Gourlade and Moracin may be regarded as the particular representatives of Vergennes. It was to Moracin that Vergennes had submitted the memoir of Panchaud and he later resided in Pondicherry for the company until 1791. Presumably he was "the man attached to your person and to your department" whom it was the idea of Vergennes from the first to have in India. Gourlade many years later claimed that he had been put on the board of administrators by the government without his knowledge and that the government had even bought the stock required to qualify him.[49]

Unauthorized by the *arrêt* of April 14, but apparently functioning as representatives of the stockholders, another group beside the administrators appeared before 1787. They were known as *commissaires* and included well-known financial names such as Le Couteulx du Moley, Boyd, and Lalanne.[50]

The delays in the formation of the company had again made it necessary to provide by direct action of the government for the supply of the market. On February 27, 1785, Gourlade, Périer, and Bérard *aîné* were directed to send a vessel, the *Dauphin*, to China to buy silk.[51] Once the company was legally formed, the *arrêt* of May 20, 1785, turned the *Dauphin* over to it on condition of paying the expenses of the expedition, "in order that the company might have a dividend the first year".

The *arrêt* of June 18, 1785, gave sanction to the statutes and regulations of the company including articles six and seven which authorized the treaty with the English company. The *arrêt* of July 10, 1785, which was in part, if not mainly, intended to put an end to the dilatory attitude of the English government in regard to the negotiation of a treaty of commerce, also served to bring pressure on the English East India Company to proceed with the treaty with the French company by cutting off the import of cotton cloth.

[48] *Cf.* correspondence of Bérard with Vergennes discussed in my article, American Tobacco and French Politics, *Political Science Quarterly*, XL. (1925) 497–516.

[49] Bourdieu to Huber, July 8, 1791, Arch. Nat., T $38^{3/2}$. Moracin to Vergennes, Feb. 12, 1783, cited above. Gourlade to Tallien [An V.], cited above.

[50] *Cf.* signatures to *Idées Préliminaires sur le Privilège Exclusif de la Compagnie des Indes* (Paris, 1787).

[51] Arch., Nantes, C 749.

Even before the new company was legally formed, the negotiation of the treaty with the English company was resumed. Bourdieu secured the consent of Dundas of the council of control and the still prospective administrators sent Périer to treat. Périer used methods that seemed promising, making a present of £1500 to one of the English directors "who had been very serviceable in the business". Nevertheless, the negotiations lagged because the English company was unwilling to give satisfactory assurances in regard to the assortments of the goods it was to sell the French company. Barthélemy suspected that the English intended to furnish only poor goods under the treaty.[52] The dilatory attitude of the English was ended when the prohibitive *arrêt* of July 10, 1785, became known. Much opposition had been manifested in London on the ground that the proposed treaty would operate as a check on the English carrying-trade by encouraging the French, but the English directors and ministers were convinced that, taking the prohibitive *arrêts* into consideration, both political and mercantile advantages would be gained by the completion of the agreement between the companies.[53]

In December, 1785, the administrators of the French company submitted the completed treaty to the French government. It provided that for three years, beginning with September, 1787, the English company should sell annually to the French company India goods to the value of forty lakhs of rupees at an advance of fifteen per cent. for profits and expenses. Careful provision was made to control the quality and character of goods delivered. The payments were to be made through Bourdieu, Chollet, and Bourdieu,[54] upon presentation of drafts to them, which was to be regarded as equivalent to presentation to the French company itself. Bourdieu, Chollet, and Bourdieu were to put up a guarantee with the English company and, in addition, the French company was to deposit £200,000. This latter sum, however, was to bear interest at five

[52] Exposé des services de M. Bourdieu. Bourdieu to Huber, Apr. 27, 1790, Arch. Nat., T 38[2-7]. Barthélemy to Vergennes, May 6, 1785, Arch. Aff. Étr., Corr. P..., Angleterre, vol. 549.

[53] Same to same, Oct. 23, 1785, *ibid.* Mr. J. Holland Rose, in his study of *William Pitt and the National Revival,* was apparently unaware of the relations between the two India companies and represents the formation of the India company as being, to Pitt's mind, "a threatening sign" (pp. 310, 326, 327). From the material he presents, it is plain that the English contemplated and dreaded as a possibility something that seems not to have entered the calculations of the French company, namely, a treaty with the Dutch East India Company (p. 327).

[54] About this time, Bourdieu's nephew was taken into the firm; hence the change of style.

per cent. The French company was not to carry on or allow any other commerce with India. The treaty was to be terminable by either company upon fifteen months notice in advance of the beginning of the trade year (September 1).[55]

The organization thus formulated was of a modernity inconsistent with the antiquated device of monopoly which then and since has seemed the principle feature of Calonne's company. It was nothing less than an international cartel, a type not to be realized until our own day. It is hardly too much to say that what was proposed was the most clearly capitalistic business organization of its time. While the politicians on both sides viewed with alarm the prospect of confusing the lines of separation between the two communities, the business men were content to associate solely upon the basis of a mutual hope for profits. That it was impossible to overcome the opposition to the treaty in France was due to the fact that it clashed with the essentially mercantilist thought of Vergennes.

The requirement that the treaty be ratified by the French government gave Vergennes the opportunity to revenge himself for the attempt on the part of Calonne and the company to carry on such an important affair without his participation. His remark to Adhemar indicated that he was fairly well settled in his hostility to the proposed treaty as early as March, 1785. His closest advisers, Gourlade, Moracin, Dupont, Adhemar, De Luynes, had been presenting arguments against it ever since it had been proposed.

Rayneval presented arguments against the approval of the treaty which from the point of view of Vergennes were conclusive.[56] He pointed out that the treaty was wholly useless except as a device to insure profits, which would come from the pockets of other Frenchmen, to the French company and the English company. "What interest has the state in enriching a small number of individuals at the expense of the other citizens, of the king's revenues, of liberty itself, which a wise administration does not restrain except for the good of the state and not for the purpose of making anyone rich?" If the trade in Bengal could not be carried on without the aid of the English company, the French company was wholly useless. Adequately protected by the treaty of 1783, French merchants could buy Eastern goods at Copenhagen, at Lisbon, or, for that matter, in England. The Anglo-Indian cloths, of which so much was being made, did not deserve preference over those

[55] Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Asie, suppl., vol. 5.

[56] *Ibid.*

which came into France from Switzerland, Holland, the free port of Dunkirk, and Portugal. As for the claim that the company represented the nation, Rayneval replied that it was merely a useless and burdensome intermediary. The obligation implied in the homologation of the statutes of the company, he left delicately but firmly to Calonne: it was the act of a single minister. The motives of the English company in agreeing to the treaty were simply the considerations presented to the directors by Bourdieu in 1784, namely, that the treaty would serve to cut off the French, politically and commercially, from direct dealings with the Indians.

Rayneval himself had a scheme that as a scheme was very interesting in its possibilities. He proposed that the French company should attach itself rather to the Spanish Company of the Philippines, which had the right of carrying goods to South America and from the East Indies, and thus had the opportunity to pick up an additional profit of about thirty per cent. Manila, Rayneval supposed, was an unrivaled base for the trade with the Chinese, who were quite accustomed and willing to bring their goods there. The silver supply of America would afford the allied companies a great advantage in India, where the French, on their part, could offer the protection of treaties and firmans. Thus the Franco-Spanish combination "could buy everything the employees of the English company have" and shut out from the Continent even smuggled English goods by the low prices that would be possible. Aware of the fate of the Suez project, described below, at the hands of the company, Rayneval protested against the submission to it of his proposal. "It is too important to be considered only by a company whose system it upsets." The ultimate justification of the company and of its privilege could be only the political results, declared Rayneval. If no system which met that test could be organized, he advocated the adoption of the proposal of Dupont to open the Ile de France to all nations for the purchase and sale of Eastern goods and to open the French ports to such nations as it seemed desirable to admit.

Here, after all, was the crux of the matter: While Calonne and the bankers and business men with whom he was so intimately bound wished to organize a big business enterprise without regard to the old lines of political conflict, Vergennes and the men who surrounded him were equally determined that the new organization of Indian trade should subserve the development of political power. In terms, the difference between the two groups reduced itself almost to a mere question of emphasis. Calonne and his banker friends wanted political power as

an incident to their business aims; Vergennes and Rayneval wanted economic strength as a means to political achievement. In this matter, the two groups typified respectively two branches of the antinomy which the nationalist state of the nineteenth century has carried within itself, the nominalism of its internal policy and the realism of its external existence.[57]

Not only had the organization of the company followed a course which neutralized, as far as it was concerned, the political possibilities inherent in the situation, but it had also interposed its privilege as an obstacle to the utilization of arrangements which seemed perfectly adapted to contribute effectively to the great end, the increase of French influence in India without increasing the danger of war with the English. As M. F. Charles-Roux has ably shown in his monograph, *Le Projet Français de Commerce avec l'Inde par Suez sous le Règne de Louis XVI* (1927), just as the formation of the company was being completed, the efforts of Choiseul-Gouffier with the Sublime Porte and of Truguet with the beys of Egypt had at last brought to fruition the centuries-old plans and hopes of many Frenchmen to open the Suez routes to French trade with India. It seemed in the words of an earlier memoir writer quoted by M. Charles-Roux,[58] that "cette courte et facile communication doit nous procurer l'avantage de dominer aux Indes, non en conquérants, qualité qui y convient moins à la France qu'à toute autre puissance, mais en y entretenant les comptoirs les plus utiles et en empêchant aucune nation européenne d'y donner la loi". A series of memoirs in especially rapid sequence between 1773 and 1783 showed that the idea was, to say the least, current. Under the auspices of the Maréchal de Castries, Choiseul-Gouffier and Truguet had obtained a treaty which seemed to offer substantial security to a French line across the isthmus and down the Red Sea to the Indian Ocean and the Malabar coast. The advantage in time and cost of transportation over the immense detour around Africa promised to be enormous.

The English company had deliberately "killed" various promising English attempts to exploit the route because it threatened the company's monopoly. The French company, it appears, took the same intransigent attitude. As soon as Castries had received the dispatches from Truguet at Cairo, he entrusted them to Cabre, the inspector of the Levant trade, with instructions to find some way to resolve the contradiction between the arrangements Truguet had made and the privilege of the company.

[57] W. Sombart, *Das Wirtschaftsleben im Zeitalter des Hochkapitalismus* (Munich and Leipzig, 1928), pp. 42–73.

[58] *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

A laborious negotiation ensued between Cabre, the Baron de Tott, a Hungarian noble who had become an Eastern expert for the French government,[59] the Marseilles merchants Audibert and Seymandi, who stood ready with a capital of three million livres to develop the Suez trade with India, and the India Company.

The great objective of the company, based as it was on the expectation of a treaty with the English company which was just in process of completion, was to head off in some way the operation of the new route. This was very neatly done by a merger between the company and Seymandi, in which the latter was reduced to a secondary rôle. "To show its deference and its desire to coördinate its operations with the intentions of the government", the company in a special stockholders' meeting on August 27, 1785, decided to exploit the Suez route itself "at its own risk and peril". Seymandi was made director for Suez commerce at a salary of 12,000 livres a year—to do nothing. The company could thus proceed without fear that the English company would be alarmed by an energetic development of the Suez route. Although it was recognized that the company's capital was no more than adequate for the arrangement originally contemplated, including the treaty with the English company,[60] it made some show of getting the *Calonne* ready for a trial voyage. A thousand occasions for delay intervened. Castries regarded it as unsafe to communicate the treaties of Truguet because of "the slight value attached by the company to the Suez enterprise, its connection with the English company, the interest of the latter in obtaining them, the slight concern of our own company in concealing them".[61] By January, 1786, the Suez project was regarded as buried. It was revived again in the same year, but it was only in the autumn of 1788 that the first vessel arrived at Mocha. It was held there for a long time and arrived at Suez on March 31, 1789. Its cargo was sold in France just before the abolition of the company's privilege.

The fate of the Suez project and the drastic criticism of Rayneval made it obvious that the English connection with the French company would block any considerable development of the insistent political purposes of Vergennes. Calonne tried to save something out of the wreck of the treaty by agreeing that as it stood it was bad for France and for the company and by proposing that the articles which made it impossible for the company to lend itself to the development of the Suez route

[59] Sir R. M. Keith to Carmarthen, Dec. 3, 1785, quoted by Rose, *William Pitt and the National Revival*, p. 482.

[60] Letter of Vergennes, dated Jan., 1786, quoted by Charles-Roux, *op cit.*, p. 99.

[61] Castries to Calonne, Dec. 22, 1785, *ibid.*, p. 98.

(articles 19 and 20) be eliminated and the rest subjected to further discussion.[62] Vergennes remained obdurate. In spite of the insistence of the administrators that the agreement was purely commercial, that Pitt, Sidney, and Dundas had seen it only as *ex-officio* directors of the English company, and in spite of the specific provisions of the French company's own statutes, homologated by the *arrêt* of July 19, 1785, which authorized such arrangements with the English company, he refused to ratify.[63]

The defeat of the treaty dislocated the whole financial arrangement of the company. The original capital of 20,000,000 livres was adequate only to carry on business in combination with the English company. Vergennes's refusal to ratify made it necessary to raise capital adequate to sustain independent operations. After a delay of about six months, the company succeeded in securing the offer of a loan of 20,000,000 livres at the rate of six per cent. per annum plus a four per cent. preferential dividend out of profits. The loan was submitted to the government for its approval. The company explained that from the beginning of the promotion, the limited capital of twenty million livres had been regarded as insufficient for independent operation. Since an adequate capital had seemed too large for the market to furnish, the company had counted on the treaty with the English company which the government had refused to ratify. In the situation thus created, it was urged, no dividend could be paid in 1788 without additional capital. The chambers of commerce, already hostile, would clamor about the incompetence of the company. Without credit, it would have no standing in Europe.

The conditions of the loan, however, and the arguments for it were probably less startling to the government (and, it is hoped, to the reader) than the signatures of the syndicate that offered the loan: "L. P. duc d'Orleans. Barons. P. Cte. de Proli. D. Lalanne."[64]

It is hardly necessary to say that the loan was not approved. Instead, the company was authorized by an *arrêt* of September 21, 1786, to issue twenty million livres more of stock and at the same time was granted an extension of its privilege to fifteen years of peace.

The marketing of the stock seems to have been badly planned. Nearly the whole issue, seventeen thousand shares, was placed on the market at once.[65] The government, doubly committed by its interference with

[62] Calonne to Vergennes, Jan. 1, 1786, Arch Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Asie, suppl., vol. 5.

[63] Exposé des services de M. Bourdieu.

[64] Conditions of a loan of 20,000,000 livres offered to the Compagnie des Indes, dated July 7, 1786, Arch. Aff. Étr., Mém. et Doc., Asie, suppl., vol. 5.

[65] A. Mathiez, *La Corruption Parlementaire sous la Terreur* (1927), p. 141.

the treaty and with the loan, undertook to sustain the market. Calonne entrusted 11,500,000 livres, drawn from the navy and the *maison du roi,* to one Veymeranges, who, through Pyron de Chaboulon, Seneff, and a number of other brokers, proceeded to buy East India and Water Company shares.[66] This assured coöperation presented a magnificent opportunity to the Abbé d'Espagnac, who a few months previously had already made one *coup* in the shares of the company. Pyron and Seneff came to an understanding with him and, between them, they worked the shares of the India Company up from about 1200 livres to a "top" of 1700 livres. Pyron and Seneff ended their operation by selling their holdings to Espagnac, who continued to buy until he held commitments from "les baissiers"—the short interest—to deliver him 14,503 more shares of stock than had been issued. As has happened more recently, the short interest abandoned the principle of a free market and the validity of contracts and demanded to be saved. A judgment of the council annulled the contracts and the liquidation of the affair was entrusted to Haller of Girardot, Haller, and Company, and Le Couteulx de la Noraye.[67] They let the "shorts" off with a penalty, arrived at by I do not know what logic, of 4,045,500 livres, which Espagnac as a matter of fact never received. Much notoriety was given the whole affair by the famous polemic between Mirabeau and Espagnac.[68] Although the hired pen of Mirabeau came off decidedly second best, his disparaging insinuations continued to weigh upon the government, the company, and the reputation of Calonne.

The conspicuousness of Espagnac's operations and especially its dramatic conclusion diverted the attention of the public at the time and that of historians since then from the less picturesque actuality. As reflected in the letters of the chamber of commerce of Bordeaux to its deputy extraordinary, the story current at the time was something like this: The government lent considerable sums (13,000,000 livres) to Espagnac to buy East India shares; Espagnac, stuffed ("egorgé") with shares, collapsed; the government was embarrassed by the loss of the money which the abbé was unable to return; the offer of the company

[66] Conseil des Anciens: Rapport par Porcher (l'Indre) sur l'affaire Veymeranges. Vendémiaire, An IV., Arch. Nat., AD XI. 58. According to Delaunay d'Angers, Calonne advanced 6,900,000 livres to the brokers and 6,000,000 to Haller and Le Couteulx de la Noraye, *Moniteur,* Oct. 10, 1793.

[67] *Jugement qui annulle des Marchés faits à terme, d'Actions de la nouvelle Compagnie des Indes, 27 novembre 1786.* John Crerar Library, *Catalogue of French Economic Documents,* no. 1119.

[68] Mirabeau, *Dénonciation de l'Agiotage* (1787); D'Espagnac, *Considérations sur la Dénonciation de l'Agiotage: Lettre au Comte de Mirabeau* (1787).

to repay this sum to the government induced it to abstain from any action against the company.[69]

The real story is somewhat different. In spite of "la grande autorité" of M. Léon Say,[70] it is not correct to say that Espagnac got his funds from the royal treasury. He used the fact of the presence of such funds on the "bull" side of the market, but these particuar funds were actually handled by Veymeranges and his brokers.

An extraordinary feature of the story was the fact that Veymeranges and his brokers were able, in spite of being on the right side of a rising market, to lose 9,000,000 livres of the 11,500,000 which Calonne had advanced to them. Veymeranges was promptly haled before the Châtelet and sued, but he managed to keep up a defense until the Year IV.[71] What had happened, probably, was that the brokers, after terminating their coöperation with Espagnac, had joined the short interest and had been ruined with the rest.

The company had thus weathered the confusion and conflict among the ministers and the crisis of an extraordinary expansion of its capital. In this form it was to endure until the revocation of its privilege in April, 1790, and the consequent reorganization. Although it cannot be said that in this brief period it accomplished any of the political purposes for which it was formed, the statistics of its business and the quotations of its shares on the Bourse reflect a substantial prosperity. The first dividend, paid in 1788, was eighteen per cent. and during 1789 the price of the stock ranged from 1800 to 1832½.[72] "Insiders" were still buying shares of the company in 1791, and even in October, 1792, one of its administrators could still describe it as "the only safe establishment and investment of one's property in France, because independent of government though not of robbers".[73] After the death of Vergennes and the fall of Calonne, the company was able to induce the government of Loménie de Brienne to enter into a treaty with the English government that served as a limited substitute for the general treaty between the two companies which Vergennes had defeated.[74]

[69] Chamber of Bordeaux to Letellier, July 7, 28, 1787, Arch., Bordeaux, C 4266.

[70] Quoted by Mathiez, L'Abbé d'Espagnac, in *La Corruption Parlementaire*, p. 145.

[71] Rapport par Porcher, cited above.

[72] R. Bigo, Un Grammaire de Bourse en 1789, *Annales d'Histoire Économique et Sociale*, II. (1930) 499–510.

[73] Huber to Auckland, Oct. 4, 1792, *Journal and Correspondence of Lord Auckland*, II. 451.

[74] Convention explicative entre la France et la Grande Bretagne au sujet des établissements et du commerce français dans l'Inde. Versailles, 31 août 1787. Isambert, *Recueil des Lois Anciennes*, XXVIII. 425.

The treaty provided for the importation into India by the French company of 200,000 maunds of salt, to be delivered to the English company at specified prices. The French company was to receive from the English company 18,000 maunds of saltpetre and 300 chests of opium at pre-war prices. It was doubtless an arrangement that contributed much to the prosperity of the French company in the succeeding years.

The company had also weathered—temporarily—the bitter and sustained opposition of the chambers of commerce of the kingdom. The story of that opposition, relevant and significant as it is of the "structure of politics" in the years before 1789, must be omitted from this paper. The formation of the company was another item in the program of the monarch which, like the opening of the colonies to foreigners by the *arrêt* of August 30, 1784, and the treaty of 1786, alienated the provincial merchants and promoted the revolutionary temper among a class that had been traditionally bound in intimate alliance with the absolutism. The vigorous opposition never relented from the formation of the company until the abolition of its privilege. Along with the colonial question, the East India question served effectively to bind the merchants to the support of the Constituent Assembly.[75]

[75] Letaconnoux, Le Comité des Députés Extraordinaires des Manufactures et du Commerce de France, *Annales Révolutionnaires*, vol. VI. (1913), pp. 149 ff. For the dissolution of the company in the Year II., see Mathiez, *Un Procès de Corruption sous la Terreur: l'Affaire de la Compagnie des Indes*. In the *cahier* of the merchants of Havre, Begouen, who was the author, indicated "trois actes marquants de l'administration . . . comme les causes principales et notoires du declin des manufactures, de la désertion des ateliers, des faillites nombreuses, du découragement et de la misère des peuples condamnés à l'oisiveté, à la nudité, et aux horreurs de la faim", that is, the *arrêt* upon *entrepôts*, the reëstablishment of the East India Company, and the Treaty of 1786, E. Pollio, Le Commerce Maritime pendant la Révolution, pt. I., *La Révolution Française*, LXXXIV. (1931) 311.

Frederick L. Nussbaum.

The University of Wyoming.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

McClellan's Changing Views on the Peace Plank of 1864

The ringing unionism of General McClellan's letter accepting the Democratic nomination for the presidency in 1864, together with the sentiments he had previously expressed in his Harrison's Landing letter, the Woodward letter, and his West Point address, has led to the assumption that the general at no time wavered in his "Union at any price" position. However, some apparently hitherto unused documents among the McClellan papers in the Library of Congress, which almost certainly are early drafts of the nominee's letter of acceptance, throw doubt upon the validity of this assumption.[1] They reveal that at one time between the nomination and McClellan's formal acceptance, the candidate's interpretation of the ambiguous second resolution in the platform squared, so far as practical results were concerned, with that of the ultra peace men in the party.

In any case the Democratic party was committed to an endeavor to bring about a cessation of hostilities.[2] But dissension raged within the party over the prime consideration of whether or not a previous recognition of the Union by the Confederate States should be an indispensable condition of the proposed armistice. The Vallandigham group, asserting that no conditions were to be attached, insisted that the platform meant peace and possible union.[3] The more conservative element of the party asserted no less strenuously that it meant union and possible peace.

McClellan, in an effort to reconcile these divergent factions appears to have been willing at one time to accept the doctrine of an unconditional armistice and to risk the resumption of hostilities in case negotiations should break down. In his belief that the war could be renewed and in his determination that it should be, he differed from the radical

[1] These documents are to be found in the McClellan Manuscripts, *Second Series* (hereinafter cited as "McClellan MSS. II."). There is a mass of valuable political material in this second series. My attention was called to it through the courtesy of Dr. Curtis W. Garrison of the Division of Manuscripts.

[2] Edward McPherson, *Political History of the United States . . . during the Great Rebellion*, 3rd ed., pp. 419–420.

[3] See Vallandigham's speech to the ratification meeting at Dayton, Ohio, Sept. 6, quoted in the Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, Sept. 8. According to Vallandigham, the convention "meant peace, and it said it".

peace faction. But in assenting to an armistice in which the Northern objective in the war was not forthwith recognized, he placed himself in a dangerous position, and one which easily could have led to betrayal of the confidence unionist Democrats had placed in him. Perhaps he felt that if he made it sufficiently clear to the South that in a final analysis union was the absolute *sine qua non* of peace there would be no possibility of an armistice due to opposition from Richmond. Thus his concession to the ultra peace men would not terminate in an irretrievable blunder. But this is merely conjectural. In any case, older and possibly wiser heads saw only disaster involved in chaining up the dogs of war without definite assurances from the South on the question of the Union. Consequently, sufficient pressure was brought to bear upon McClellan to cause him to revert to his earlier decisive attitude and to insist upon recognition of the Union by the South as an indispensable preliminary to the cessation of hostilities.

The idea of an armistice did not burst suddenly upon the Democratic nominee with the adoption of the platform at Chicago. Aside from suggestions in the New York press, it had been proposed to him at least as early as June 20 by George W. Morgan of Mt. Vernon, Ohio. Again on August 4 Morgan wrote: "A letter from you to your friend Douglass [*sic*] of Ills. declaring in favor of an armistice would double [y]our chances at Chicago."[4] That the general was not impressed is perhaps best indicated by his biting comment on the matter in a letter of August 10 to W. C. Prime, editor of the New York *Journal of Commerce*. "I receive so many suggestions that I have determined to follow my own judgment in the matter. Morgan is very anxious that I should write a letter suggesting an armistice!!!! If these fools will ruin the country I won't help them."[5]

[4] McClellan MSS. II.

[5] Copy in McClellan MSS. II., vol. 17, numbered (apparently erroneously) 639. There is no evidence that McClellan held any other than the strictest Union position at any time previous to the Chicago convention. The views expressed in his private correspondence during this period are entirely consistent with those uttered in public. If he so ardently desired the Democratic nomination in 1864 as to prostitute his principles in securing it, no recorded word or personal activity testifies to the fact. As early as Dec. 6, 1863, he wrote to his mother, "I feel very indifferent about the White House—for many reasons I do not wish it—I shall do nothing to get it and trust that Providence will decide the matter as is best for the country" (McClellan MSS. II.). In June, 1864 (day not indicated), he wrote to Frank Blair, sr.: "Here let me repeat the statement which you are aware I have more than once made, that I have not taken a single step nor said one word for the purpose of influencing the action of any political convention, and that I am not an aspirant for nomination for the Presidency" (copy in *ibid.*, vol. 16, 87283).

In the same letter he was "convinced" that the Union "should never be abandoned so long as there is a hope that it can be made to serve the welfare and happiness of the people"

Morgan persisted in his advice, however, in letters dated August 12 and August 17. Unquestionably his object was not disunion, but the fact remains that so far as is known he at no time suggested union as a condition of the armistice he proposed. In view of the widespread war weariness in the North, it must frankly be admitted that the "peace at any price" men could have asked for little more.[6]

While Morgan's letters had no influence, of course, in eliciting a pre-convention statement from McClellan, they unquestionably played an important part in causing the general to weigh most carefully the possibilities of the peace resolution after it had been adopted at Chicago. Such statements as "the masses are bent on peace", "it will be a grave mistake to take the action of a New York multitude as an index of the widespread country", "New York has become rich, and the West poor by the war", and "the peace sentiment has become a torrent which no man can check" carried conviction and could not fail to arrest a political candidate's attention. Subsequent to McClellan's nomination, Edward Farreni, writing from the office of the New York *World,* informed him that "if you do not commit yourself fully to the *peace policy* in your answer to the Executive Committee . . . a large party of peace men . . .

and "deprecate[d]" any feeling "which far from looking to that end tends in a contrary direction". While "our antagonists should be made to know that we are ready to extend the olive branch" they should likewise know that "an honorable peace" could come only "on the basis of the Union of all the States".

As early as March 16, 1864, McClellan had become suspicious of the influence of the radical peace men on the convention arrangements, and he informed S. L. M. Barlow that he didn't "intend to be made a tool of by them. . . . If these miserable intriguers think that they can use me for their purposes I will soon show them that they have mistaken their man—I am sick of the whole thing" (copy in *ibid.,* vol. 15, 86904).

[6] Morgan saw danger only in the extreme radical position demanding the withdrawal of the Federal armies from invaded territory upon the signing of an armistice (letter to McClellan, June 20, McClellan MSS. II.). His plan was that an armistice for the purpose of negotiation should be proposed to extend from March 10 to April 10. He believed that war could be resumed if necessary, but he doubted that the contingency would arise (letter to McClellan, Aug. 17, *ibid.*). An otherwise unconditional armistice was justified, in his opinion, because "negotiations cannot be successfully carried on 'mid the danger of arms—the loss of a battle, or the burning of a town on either side, would retard negotiations" (letter to McClellan, Aug. 4, *ibid.*). Vallandigham, frustrated in the convention with regard to securing a platform embodying a clear-cut statement of his principles (see letters from August Belmont and Amasa J. Parker to McClellan, Sept. 3 and 5, *ibid.*) was quick to see that even a mere cessation of hostilities probably would entail the end he desired. Therefore in his ratification speech at Dayton, cited *ante,* he stated that the Democratic convention and platform "demanded peace after the failure of the experiment of war, whereby to restore the Union. And no man among the recognized advocates of peace from the beginning of this war to the present hour, has in any formal, public declaration demanded more than the Convention has declared".

intend to drop your ticket . . .". Vallandigham merely added to the general's perturbation with the warning that "if anything implying war is presented, two hundred thousand men in the West will with-[h]old their support, and many go further still".[7] Clearly the general was in a difficult position.

Overwhelmed with advice of all kinds and from all sides, McClellan began the composition of the first draft of his letter. Quoting the cessation of hostilities plank, he proceeded with a conventional reference to "the restoration of the Union, the Constitution, and the ancient harmony and fraternity of the States as they [formerly] existed . . .", expressing the desire of every patriot and Christian "that their restoration shall be secured with as small a sacrifice of blood and treasure as possible, and with no unnecessary hatred and bitterness between the contending parties". Then came the burden of his message. "Among all civilized Nations it is customary during the progress of war, for the combatants now and then to suspend hostilities temporarily for purposes of negociation and mutual explanations. Such suspensions have sometimes resulted in satisfactory settlements and returns to peace, and at other times in renewals of the contests. These temporary cessations of hostilities for purposes of negociation constitute a part of the military code of all civilized nations, except in cases where absolute subjugation and extermination are intended." It was "the desire and object" of the Democratic party "to exhaust all peaceable means consistent with the honor and dignity of the Republic, to induce the people of the revolted States to return to their allegiance to the Union and the Constitution". Should the Democratic candidate be elected, it would be his duty "to hold out the olive branch to those now in arms against the Government, and to offer them all the rights and privilidges [*sic*] guaranteed them by the Constitution, in case they will lay down their arms and return to the Union.[8] But should these peaceable and conciliatory efforts be per-

[7] Morgan to McClellan, Aug. 12, Aug. 17; Farreni to same, Sept. 2; *ibid.* Vallandigham to same, Sept. 4, McClellan MSS., *First Series.*

[8] The "rights and privilidges" guaranteed them by the constitution were summed up by the general thus: "In the accomplishment of their great 'aim and object', the Democratic party desires [later changed to "are willing"] to announce frankly to the Southern people that they do not wage war for the abolition of slavery, confiscation, political disfranchisement, or for the destruction of any other right or privilege pertaining to the States, nor for revenge or any purpose of degrading or humiliating them, [preceding eleven words later crossed out] but simply for the Union and the Constitution as established by the founders of the Republic." The view expressed here is entirely consistent with that set forth in the Harrison's Landing letter (McPherson, *op. cit.*, p. 385). It is worth noting, however, that nothing was said in the final letter of acceptance with regard to slavery. But McClellan's

sistently rejected and terms of peace on the 'basis of the Union and Constitution' be definitely refused, then with a united North, with right and justice on our side, and the blessing of the Almighty, we shall be obliged to appeal again to the God of battles, and leave the issue to the arbitrament of the sword."[9] Clearly McClellan had shifted his position with regard to armistice since Morgan's first letters, and, while he still regarded the South's "return to their allegiance to the Union and the laws" as "vital and indispensable", he looked upon this consummation as the possible result of negotiations conducted under an armistice rather than as a preliminary condition to it. The general was gambling with the gods.

For some reason which is not apparent, McClellan was not completely satisfied with his letter and he made an entirely fresh start. The resulting second draft[10] was then carefully worked over, and, so far as phraseology is concerned, formed the basis of the third draft. But the third draft embodied a fundamental change in attitude, and, with various alterations in diction but with no significant variation in content, became the fourth draft from which the final letter was drawn.[11]

"We have fought enough to satisfy the military honor of the two sections", runs the second draft, "and to satiate the vengeance of the most vindictive. It is therefore my opinion, that while the restoration of the Union is and should [later changed to "must"] continue to be an [later changed to "the"] indispensible condition in any settlement of the questions at issue in this war, we should use our best endeavors to attain a pacific solution of the controversy without further effusion of blood. I think that all peaceable means, consistent with the honor and safety

personal interest in the matter is further evidenced by a separate and distinct pencilled statement written in the general's hand which is among the McClellan papers. In this he says that he opposes slavery as a national evil and feels that emancipation would tend to promote national security, "but I do not think that forcible abolition should be made an object of the war or a necessary condition of peace and reunion" (McClellan MSS. II., vol. 23, 88912). It is possible that this is a rough draft of what McClellan planned to make a very important paragraph in his letter of acceptance.

[9] McClellan MSS. II., vol. 23, 88908.

[10] This second draft is marked in McClellan's hand *"1st Rough Draft"*, but it appears to be merely the first draft of his second attempt.

[11] Unfortunately the various drafts of the letter of acceptance are not dated. However, their logical order would seem, by context, to be as indicated above. The first draft, since it quotes the cessation of hostilities plank, could not have been written before Aug. 30, and the final one, of course, was indited on or before Sept. 8. It would seem indubitable that McClellan's changes in position came within this nine-day period. As the McClellan correspondence is bound at the present time, these drafts are out of place. The specific references to the four preliminary drafts are as follows (all in the *Second Series*): first, vol. 23, 88908; second, vol. 21, 88343; third, vol. 21, 88353; fourth, vol. 23, 88959.

of the country, should be exhausted to secure the restoration of the Union, with the Constitutional rights of all the States fully guaranteed for all future time." [12] Then follows the idea of resumption of war should the negotiations fail, "for it is better to fight upon the question of the Union than for the adjustment of the inevitable question of a boundary line with its many kindred subjects of dispute, and I, for one, could not look in the face my comrades of the army and navy who have survived so many bloody battles and tell them that their labors and the sacrifice of such numbers of their brothers had been in vain—that we had abandoned the Union for which we had so often risked our lives". As a parting shot at Northern disunionists he added, "In view of circumstances to which I need not advert this somewhat long and personal explanation has seemed necessary".[13] Yet, even so, he had again failed to impose any conditions as a preliminary to the general armistice.

About this time, apparently, McClellan received a letter from August Belmont, agent of the Rothschilds and chairman of the Democratic National Committee, which seems to have determined the final form of the general's statement. "It is absolutely necessary", wrote Belmont, "that in your letter of acceptance you place yourself squarely and unequivocally on the ground that you will never surrender one foot of soil and that peace can only be based upon the reconstruction of the *Union*—In other words cessation of hostilities can only be agreed upon *after* we have sufficient guarantee from the South that they are ready for a peace under the Union. . . ." [14] Accordingly, a new note crept into McClellan's third draft. Retaining the sentiment that there had been sufficient fighting, he insinuated the fundamental change into the next sentence. "It is, then, my opinion", ran the new version, "that, while the restoration of the Union in all its integrity is and must continue to be the indispensable condition in any settlement of the questions at issue in this war, we should, *as soon as it is clear, or even probable, that our present adversaries are willing to negotiate upon the basis of the immediate restoration of the Federal Union of the States,*[15] exhaust all peaceable means consistent with the honor and safety of the country,

[12] In the corrected form of this second draft, the second and third sentences as quoted above were telescoped into one, to read: "It is therefore my opinion that while the restoration of the Union is and must continue to be the indispensible [*sic*] condition in any settlement of the questions at issue in this war, we should exhaust all peaceable means, consistent with the honor and safety of the country, to secure the restoration of the Union with the Constitutional rights of all the States guaranteed for all future time."

[13] McClellan MSS. II., vol. 21, 88343.

[14] Sept. 3, McClellan MSS. II.

[15] The italics are mine.

to secure that restoration of the Union, with the Constitutional rights of all the States guaranteed for all future time."[16]

The general's "repudiation" of his platform was now nearly ready for publication. All that remained to be done was to strike out any phrases smacking of defeatism,[17] to eliminate "any word in regard to *peace,* which cd be tortured by any [one] into anything like ignoble compromise",[18] to add as a separate paragraph a plank which had been inadvertently left out of the platform as reported by the resolutions committee,[19] and to tone up the whole document with a "punch" sentence or so[20] in order that it might convey an impression of crisp, terse unionism in the candidate.[21]

McClellan, then, had shifted his ground twice. Starting with an attitude of contempt for armistice in any sense, he had adopted the idea of unconditional armistice at the risk of disunion. He then took a position on middle ground which made armistice impossible from the Southern point of view, yet did not ignore the Northern demand for potential "peace with honor". Did he change his attitude to conform with changing conceptions of the relative strength of the factions in his party? Was it due to his inability to fathom immediately the dangerous implications of his second position? Did he carry over into political life the indecision which characterized his military career? Or was he changing consciously and deliberately in an endeavor to do what he honestly

[16] McClellan MSS. II., vol. 21, 88353.

[17] For example, the sentence commencing "We have fought enough to satisfy the military honor of the two sections" was dropped in the fourth draft, which, from its context could not have been written earlier than Sept. 6 (McClellan MSS. II., vol. 23, 88959).

[18] W. Adams to McClellan, no place, no date, McClellan MSS. II., vol. 23, 88980. This would seem to be William Adams, pastor of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church in New York. From the context of the letter, Adams had gone over McClellan's letter critically. It is possible that those interlineations in this fourth draft which are not in the general's hand, are Adams's. For example, there is the sentence: "And no peace can be permanent without Union." McClellan himself seems to have changed the wording of his key line from "so soon as it is clear or even probable that our present adversaries are *willing to negotiate* upon the basis of the Federal Union of the States" to "*ready for peace* upon the basis", etc.

[19] Amasa J. Parker to McClellan, Sept. 5, McClellan MSS. II. This is the sentence in both the fourth draft and the final letter commencing, "Let me add, what I doubt not was, although unexpressed, the sentiment of the convention . . .".

[20] For example, the sentence "The Union is the one condition of peace—we ask no more" was added to the final letter (McPherson, *op. cit.*), but is not to be found in any of the drafts.

[21] The success of this endeavor is reflected in the editorial opinion on the letter. See especially the Detroit *Free Press,* Sept. 10; the Chicago *Post,* Sept. 10; the New York *World,* Sept. 9; the Columbus *Ohio Statesman,* Sept. 10; and the *Missouri Republican,* Sept. 10.

thought was best for the people of the North? As in so many other cases, the records are silent as to the human aspect of the matter.

CHARLES R. WILSON.

The University of Cincinnati.

NAVASSA: A FORGOTTEN ACQUISITION

A little known aspect of the expansion of the United States is the acquisition of certain scattered island "appurtenances" which the government has refrained from speaking of as possessions. Even before the Civil War, expansionists sought to extend American rule over non-contiguous territory and made efforts to secure Cuba, the Hawaiian Islands, a naval station in Santo Domingo, Alaska, and a zone across Panama. These ambitious plans failed, but quite incidentally, and almost without public notice, a peculiar beginning was made in the collection of islands outside our territorial waters.

In the forties and fifties of the last century, large portions of the older agricultural area of the United States showed unmistakable signs of a loss of fertility. The appearance of a new and potent fertilizer, called guano, was hailed therefore as a godsend and demands for it multiplied. The only large supply then exploited was located on certain islands off the coast of Peru where for centuries hosts of birds had been depositing this fertilizer. The Peruvian government found it a constant and convenient source of revenue and sold it only through British or Peruvian agents who charged so high a price and provided so irregular a supply that American farmers became exasperated. The State Department busied itself during the fifties attempting to arrange with Peru, Ecuador, and Venezuela for a cheaper and better marketed supply, but repeated efforts accomplished very little. Adventurous sea captains therefore were encouraged to seek out uninhabited and out of the way islands where birds might have dwelt peacefully for long periods of time. Several of these were reported, but the announcement of efforts to take off guano might lead to complications. As a matter of fact the exploitation of the guano possibilities of a small island, Aves, some three hundred miles off the coast of Venezuela had caused that republic to remember a long forgotten jurisdiction over this far away dot and to drive off the American diggers. The United States had never claimed any islands by right of discovery and had no machinery either for legalizing such claims or for authorizing the government to protect them. If a repetition of the Aves discomfiture was to be prevented it would be necessary to enact a

law providing regulations for registering such discoveries at the State Department and enabling the President to protect the rights of the discoverers by force if necessary.

Upon the urging of New York and Boston guano speculators, William H. Seward sponsored a bill in Congress which became the law of August 18, 1856. This act provided that when any American citizen "may have discovered, or shall hereafter discover, a deposit of guano on any island, rock, or key not within the lawful jurisdiction of any other government, and not occupied by the citizens of any other government, and shall take peaceable possession thereof, and occupy the same, said island, rock or key, may, at the discretion of the President of the United States, be considered as appertaining to the United States". Evidence of the formal act of taking possession and maintaining peaceable possession in the name of the United States was to be filed at the State Department together with a bond to the effect that the discoverers would sell guano only according to rules laid down in the act. When explorers had fulfilled these requirements the island, rock, or key might be proclaimed as appertaining to the United States. Trade with such places was to be regulated as coasting trade between different parts of the United States, the laws relating to acts performed or crimes committed on merchant vessels on the high seas were applied to govern these islands, and the President might use the "land and naval forces of the United States" to protect the rights of the discoverers.[1]

Under the authority of this act, between 1856 and 1885 some seventy islands and groups of islands were recognized as appertaining to the United States. The first two were Baker and Jarvis Islands lying nearly on the equator southwest of the Hawaiian Islands, 0° 15′ N. Lat., 176° 30′ W. Long., and 0° 21′ S. Lat. and 159° 52′ W. Long. respectively. They were registered at the State Department on October 28, 1856, though no proclamation was issued by the Secretary until March 2, 1861. Since that time they have been occupied intermittently by American guano diggers, but in 1889 Great Britain took possession of Jarvis without any protest from the State Department. They are designated as American, British, or undetermined possessions on a variety of maps and the United States seemingly has no active interest in them.[2] It is with the third island to be registered that we are particularly concerned.

[1] 11 *U. S. Stat.*, 119–120. The details of these negotiations with the Latin American republics and the legislation subsequently enacted are contained in a paper "Latin American Guano Diplomacy" delivered by the author before the Hispanic American Seminar at George Washington University during the summer of 1932. It will appear in the published proceedings of those sessions.

[2] John Bassett Moore, *A Digest of International Law* (Washington, 1906), I. 572, 574.

On July 1, 1857, Peter Duncan, a ship captain, discovered that the island of Navassa contained guano. Navassa is a barren isle, shaped like an oyster shell, about a square mile in area, formed of volcanic limestone and so filled with holes as to have the appearance of a petrified sponge. It is situated some thirty miles west of Haiti, 18° 10′ N. Lat., 75° W. Long., about seventy-five miles east of Jamaica. Captain Duncan found it unoccupied and covered with an amount of guano which he estimated at one million tons. He took possession in the name of the United States and upon his return home assigned his discoverer's rights to Captain E. O. Cooper. The latter and Edward K. Cooper of Baltimore, who seems to have been the business agent, sent John B. Lewis to the island to work the guano deposit and filed formal notice of the discovery at the State Department on December 3, 1857, without supplying either the required certificate of peaceable possession or the bond.[3]

Cooper had once had a partner in the guano trade, a Jamaican, Ramoth by name, with whom he had broken, as it was later reported, because of Ramoth's inefficiency. The latter had harbored a desire to get even and now saw his chance. He went to Port-au-Prince, suggested to the emperor that the island belonged to Haiti and obtained a lease of the island, contracting to give the government one-third of the proceeds of any guano sales. The new leaseholder then went to the governor of Jamaica and told him that Americans were taking Ramoth's guano. The Jamaican executive promptly gave him a letter to the emperor of Haiti supporting a request for a war vessel to protect this Haitian island from American invasion. E. K. Cooper learned of this and hastened to complete the formalities connected with filing evidence in the State Department. He presented an affidavit of peaceful possession which Lewis had made recently and on April 23 warned the Secretary of State that the Haitian government might interfere.

The emperor of Haiti acted early in June and sent two vessels to order the Americans off his island of Navassa. Cooper turned immediately to President Buchanan and Secretary Cass for protection with the result that a frigate was ordered to proceed to the scene. In spite of a second hostile expedition, the Americans stuck to their digging until Commander Turner arrived on the *Saratoga* in August. He found that the visiting officers had attempted nothing violent; nevertheless he deemed it wise to go to Port-au-Prince to give formal notice that the United States would protect American guano diggers under the law of 1856.

[3] The papers relating to the discovery and early difficulties regarding Navassa are found in the State Department Archives in vol. V. of the series marked "Miscellaneous Letters Relating to Guano Islands", hereafter referred to as Guano Is. MSS. Some of these papers are printed in 36 Cong., 1st sess., *Sen. Exec. Doc.*, vol. IX., no. 37.

The Haitian government meanwhile had become acquainted with Ramoth's real motives. Under the circumstances the emperor was not disposed to get into trouble with the United States just to satisfy the contractor's revenge and even without Turner's show of force would probably have refrained from violent action. The negro potentate contented himself with filing a protest through the Haitian commercial agent in the United States, B. C. Clark of Boston. The latter claimed Navassa for Haiti on the ground that the island in question had belonged first to Spain and then to France during the colonial era and had been acknowledged to be Haitian when the French recognized the independence of their erstwhile colony.

John Appleton, assistant secretary of state, replied, November 17, 1858, that the department had proof that the island was abandoned and derelict when Duncan discovered it and that the United States intended to protect its citizens in taking guano. Appleton concluded, though, with the statement "the act does not make it obligatory upon the government to retain permanent possession of the island". Sometime later Cooper filed the required bond and on December 8, 1859, Cass at length issued the first guano island proclamation declaring that the required notice of the discovery of guano and the occupation of Navassa in the name of the United States had been filed in the State Department, and that the United States government would protect American citizens in taking guano from the island.[4] The act of 1856 as interpreted by the State Department was not intended to invest the United States with sovereignty over any of these guano islands[5] and the proclamation simply stated that the Secretary of State recognized the fact that the island was being occupied in the name of the United States. Presumably the legal status of the island was that of an "appurtenance" rather than a "possession".

Guano continued to be taken from Navassa in the years that followed, principally by the Navassa Phosphate Company and the United States continued to regard the island with an eye which was at least occasionally watchful. When Haiti sought to establish its claim to the island in 1872, Secretary Fish issued an elaborate denial of any such right,[6] but no

[4] Appleton's letter is found in the State Department Archives, Domestic Letters, XLIX., 366. The proclamation is found in the State Department Archives, Guano Is. MSS. V., and is printed in part in 137 *U. S. Reports*, 220–221. Other claimants appeared who filed affidavits of discovery for the same island but the State Department ignored them. Their papers are in the Guano Is. MSS. V.

[5] W. R. Castle, Acting Secretary of State, to the author, Sept. 1, 1932.

[6] Fish to Preston, Dec. 31, 1872, June 10, 1873, Notes to Haiti, I., 124, 153, State Dept. Archives.

other official attention was given the question by the department. The rather uncertain status of the island was clarified, however, by the courts as the result of a riot. In 1889 some Negro laborers attacked their white bosses, and the superintendent and several of his assistants were killed. At the request of the American consul at Kingston, Jamaica, a British war ship was sent to the island to maintain order and the U. S. S. *Kearsarge* brought the Negroes to Baltimore where they were tried and convicted of murder under the guano act of 1856. Their counsel sought to stay the execution on the grounds that the law of 1856 was unconstitutional, that the island did not appertain to the United States, and that the United States court had no jurisdiction over crimes committed on Navassa. The case passed to the Supreme Court which refused to accept these contentions and decided that "the island of Navassa must be considered as appertaining to the United States".[7]

The last link in the rather submerged chain binding the island to the United States was forged in the twentieth century. Although guano digging ceased during the first decade and Navassa was to all intents abandoned, the State Department did not admit any change in its status. In fact it was not long before this rather moribund interest in the "appurtenance" was revived. As the Panama Canal was approaching completion, Navassa assumed a new importance. The island lay in a direct sea lane from New York to Panama and was the first landfall sighted by ships sailing northward from Panama to New York. Its position made it a menace to shipping and plans were initiated to set up a warning light upon it.

General George W. Gordon, Representative from Tennessee, introduced a bill to erect a light house to serve as a monument to Matthew Fontaine Maury; it was proposed to build this structure on Navassa. In due course a congressional committee stopped to view Navassa and Representative Esch was moved to poetical expression. One of his stanzas expressed his hope:

[7] The report of Jones *v.* U. S. is in 137 *U. S. Reports*, 202–224. See also a pamphlet *The Navassa Island Riot* (Baltimore, 1889), published by the National Grand Tabernacle, Order of Galilean Fishermen, to raise money for the defense. During the Cuban revolution Navassa was used as a base to aid the revolutionaries and an American was convicted for violating U. S. law (*Revised Stat.*, sec. 5286) thereby. In 1898 some Haitians or Dominicans were reported as occupying the island and preventing the agents of the Navassa Phosphate Company from landing. No action was taken, guano digging days were about over, and the company nearly defunct. Even the Haitians abandoned the island. When the Phosphate Company went into the hands of a receiver its rights were sold but the purchasers did not prosper. Moore, *Digest of International Law*, I. 577.

Soon may thy reign of terror end
And welcome lights their rays extend
To gladden the weary storm-tossed sailor's sight
On ships that pass by in the night—Navassa.

The proposal to commemorate Maury's services was abandoned after Gordon's death but Congress provided the light. The House, under the influence of a reading of Esch's poetic plea by Adamson of Georgia, inserted the necessary appropriation and the Senate concurred.[8] The purpose of Congress thus to light more adequately an important approach to the Panama Canal made necessary a public notice to the world. President Wilson proclaimed on January 17, 1916, that whereas the Island of Navassa was then "under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any other government", and whereas Congress had decided to build a light station thereon, "the said Island of Navassa in the West Indies be and the same is hereby reserved for lighthouse purposes, such reservation being deemed necessary in the public interests, subject to such legislative action as the Congress of the United States may take with respect thereto".[9]

In due time and after great difficulty the light house was erected and since October 21, 1917, has flashed its nightly warning to passing ships.[10] To the general public Navassa is still as obscure as it always has been, but nevertheless it remains the oldest of our islands whether possessions or "appurtenances".

Roy F. Nichols.

The University of Pennsylvania.

[8] *Cong. Rec.*, 63 Cong., 1st sess., 4522; Act of Oct. 22, 1913, 38 *U. S. Stat.* 224. See also *Cong. Rec.*, 62 Cong., 1st sess., 1063 and House Bill 8895, same session.

[9] 39 *U. S. Stat.*, 1763. W. R. Castle, Acting Secretary of State, to author, Sept. 1, 1932.

[10] George R. Putnam, An Important New Guide for Shipping, *Nat. Geog. Mag.*, XXXIV. 401. At first the light was tended by several keepers who lived there with their families but so isolated was the spot where mail could be received only two or three times a year that it was difficult to find any one who would take this post. In May, 1929, therefore the light was made automatic and the island is now visited but twice a year by a light house tender. At these times the light is thoroughly overhauled and the acetylene tanks refilled. G. R. Putnam, Commissioner of Lighthouses, to the author, Oct. 10, 1932.

DOCUMENTS

The Lyons-Seward Treaty of 1862

On April 25, 1862, an Anglo-American treaty concerning the African slave trade was unanimously ratified by the Senate of the United States. Its conclusion accorded well with the general policy of the Lincoln administration. To legislate against the slave trade was an obvious way of conciliating all shades of Republican feeling in the states, without offending the Union Democrats. To conclude with Great Britain a convention of the kind she had so frequently suggested was also a means of enlisting British sympathy for the North. Until the outbreak of the Civil War the United States had always repulsed any proposals involving the search of American vessels by British warships engaged in hunting slavers. She now agreed to permit the practice in certain seas, but the Secretary of State was careful to let it be known that the convention had been "freely offered by this government to Great Britain, not bought or solicited".[1] Seward's statement was apparently confirmed by the treaty papers laid before Congress and Parliament,[2] and this version of the story has hitherto been unquestioned. Its intentional inaccuracy is, however, revealed by a study of the secret correspondence between Lord Lyons, British minister at Washington, and the British foreign office printed below.[3]

In the spring of 1861, the American cruiser squadron stationed off West Africa, under the terms of the Webster-Ashburton treaty (1842), had been withdrawn to assist in the Southern blockade. It became more difficult than ever to prevent the slavers, plying between Africa and Cuba, from sheltering under the American flag. As early as May 10, 1861, Secretary Seward told the British minister at Washington that he was willing to make some alternative arrangement for protecting the Stars and Stripes from this abuse. Lord Lyons was instructed

[1] Seward to Perry, U. S. Minister to Spain, Aug. 2, 1862, published on Dec. 1, 1862, 37 Cong., 3 sess., *House Exec. Docs.*, vol. I., no. 1, pt. 1, p. 473.

[2] 37 Cong., 2 sess., *Sen. Exec. Docs.*, vol. V., no. 57; *Parl. Papers* [Command 3160], H. C., 1863, vol. LXXI., pp. 286 ff.

[3] Infra, pp. 516 ff. The transcripts which follow are taken from the Public Record Office, London. The almost unexplored series, Foreign Office, Slave Trade (F. O. 84) throws much light on Anglo-American relations between 1815 and the Civil War. The papers published below are from the volumes F. O. 84/1170, 1171, and 115/307.

to reply that the search and arrest of such vessels by the British squadrons off West Africa and Cuba would be the most effective method. Since Seward hoped that the Civil War would soon be over, when the recalled ships could be sent back to Africa, he at first refused the offer of a convention. But he assured Lyons that meanwhile the new administration would have "none of the squeamishness about allowing American vessels to be boarded and searched which had characterized their predecessors". He even signed with the British envoy a secret memorandum to that effect. Lyons already perceived in the Union "a desire to rally the Anti-Slavery feeling in England to the Northern Cause", and seized the opportunity to obtain what he described as "something sufficiently definite for our Cruisers to act upon with respect to American slavers".[4] But he was rather doubtful "as to the constancy with which Mr. Seward would abide by his Memorandum and take his share of the blame if any trouble came out of it"; and the foreign office chiefs in London thought the private agreement "worth little or nothing".[5]

It seemed too dangerous to continue for long, although Seward lived up to his word. Instead of conveying the familiar recriminations of old days, the new United States minister in London actually thanks the British government for detecting American slavers.[6] Lord John Russell felt, however, that the memorandum "would be of little avail against a popular cry founded on the indisputable doctrine of International Law that the Right of Search cannot be lawfully exercised in time of peace". At any moment "Agitation and ill-will" might be provoked "by the appearance of a British cruiser in the Port of New York with a Slaver as a Prize". To obviate such a risk the British foreign secretary again put forward his former proposal, and on February 28, 1862, sent out to Lyons a draft Search treaty, already printed, and complete with Instructions for the Commissioners in Mixed Anglo-American Courts which would try captured British or American vessels accused of slave trading.[7] By this time Seward, largely on account of his peculiar position after the *Trent* affair, was particularly anxious to keep on friendly terms with England. He refused, however, to consider signing the draft treaty sub-

[4] Lyons and Russell correspondence, nos. 4 and 5 of May 10, Aug. 22 (confidential), Sept. 10 (confidential), Nov. 7, 13 (enclosing memorandum), 1861, and nos. 4 and 5, Feb. 28, 1862, in F. O. 84/1137, and F. O. 115/260, 307.

[5] Lyons to Russell, Nov. 11 (private), and 15 (private and confidential), 1861, P. R. O., Russell MSS., G. D. 22/25; British Museum Add. MS. 38987, f. 395, Layard Papers. "Memorandum between Seward and Lyons".

[6] Adams to Russell, Aug. 6, 1861, *et passim*, F. O. 84/1137.

[7] Russell to Lyons, Feb. 28, 1862, F. O. 115/307.

mitted to him by Lyons on March 21, "unless the proposal should have the air of coming originally from the United States".[8] Lyons, who feared that quarrels over neutral rights and the Southern blockade might disturb the existing calm at any moment, did not wait to consult the foreign office, but at once consented to Seward's subterfuge for hoodwinking the Senate and public.[9] A formal correspondence was conducted which, as already remarked, when presented to Congress and Parliament, created the impression that the overtures came from the United States, and not from Great Britain.

It was made to appear that Seward opened the negotiation on March 22 by writing to Lyons inviting him to sign a Slave Trade treaty, a draft of which he enclosed. Actually this was the identical, printed, British draft, with the formal headings reversed in red ink. Lyons played his part by replying with an objection to a clause limiting the duration of the treaty to ten years, but did not desire "to obstruct or retard the progress of the negotiation". In point of fact this clause was the only alteration Seward had made in the British draft and he suggested that Lyons, who regarded it as unimportant, should make a show of opposing it, but eventually accept it, as if overborne by the firmness of the American government. There followed, therefore, an exchange of notes in which Seward refused to remove the clause and Lyons waived his objections: whereupon the treaty was signed by the two conspirators on April 7, 1862, with the ten year limitation left in.[10]

Seward's little plot manifests his keen anxiety for the success of the negotiation. Even a sympathetic Senate would undoubtedly, he foresaw, ratify a Right of Search convention proposed by America far more readily than a British project. And this treaty involved greater concessions by the United States than had ever been requested by Great Britain since she first began building up her system of search treaties in the time of Lord Castlereagh. From the American point of view the only redeeming features were the ten year clause, which Seward suggested might be eliminated in the Senate by the anti-slavery party, and the provision that the captains and crews of condemned ships were to be sent home for trial.[11] It was a sufficiently remarkable proof of the zeal of the Lincoln government in their campaign against the slave trade that, with

[8] Lyons to Russell, Mar. 21 (telegram in cypher), 1862, F. O. 84/1171.

[9] Lyons to Russell, Mar. 21 (confidential), and Mar. 25 (confidential), 1862, F. O. 84/1171; *cf.* Lyons to Russell, Mar. 25 (private), 1862, Russell MSS., G. D. 22/26.

[10] F. O. 84/1171, F. O. 115/309, 313. These volumes contain the formal and secret correspondence between Lyons and Seward. See extracts printed below.

[11] Lyons to Russell, Mar. 31 (confidential), 1862, F. O. 84/1171.

the exception of Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy, apparently the whole administration was willing to accept this thoroughgoing treaty.[12] Lyons, for his part, was "not so sanguine" as Seward about getting it past the Senate by the latter's artifice; but the Secretary's forecast that the maneuver would succeed proved well within the mark. On April 25 Lyons was able to telegraph to London that the treaty had been ratified unanimously. Charles Sumner, who piloted it through the Senate, had brushed aside the old contention that American courts on foreign soil would be unconstitutional, and this had been the only serious objection raised.[13]

Seward was highly delighted at the success of his diplomacy. He was resting on a couch in the State Department at Washington when Sumner burst in with the news of ratification. Seward leapt to his feet, and his unpremeditated exclamation was significant. "Good God!" he cried, "The Democrats have disappeared. This is the greatest act of the administration." It was indeed an unexpectedly full approval of the new anti-slavery policy of the Lincoln government. "If I have done nothing else worthy of self-congratulation, I deem this treaty sufficient to have lived for", wrote Seward to an intimate at this time, and Sumner narrated the details of his triumph to Lord Lyons "with tears of joy in his eyes". The cold-blooded Englishman contented himself with noting that the treaty seemed "to be very generally approved".[14]

Over in England they were more enthusiastic than their envoy. Lord John Russell voiced the opinion of the foreign office when he wrote, "We all rejoice in it". Even the *Times,* much as it had always disliked Yankees and Abolitionists, joined in the general applause. Henry Brougham, last survivor of the original British abolitionist group of 1807, struck the same jubilant note heard on the other side of the Atlantic. He rose in the House of Lords to proclaim the treaty "in many respects the most important event that had occurred during the period of his sixty years warfare against the African Slave Trade".[15] Believing that

[12] So Seward told Lyons, Lyons to Russell, Mar. 25 (confidential), 1862, F. O. 84/1171. Welles, in his unreliable *Lincoln and Seward* (New York, 1874), says "The treaty was quietly negotiated. I knew nothing of it until after its ratification, for it was not submitted for Cabinet consultation at any stage of its progress" (p. 132). *Cf.* Welles, *Diary,* I. 155, 163, 166, 192–193.

[13] Lyons to Russell, Mar. 31 (private), 1862, Russell MSS., G. D. 22/26; Apr. 25, 1862, F. O. 84/1171.

[14] Lyons to Russell, Apr. 25, May 2, 1862, Russell MSS.; E. L. Pierce, *Sumner* (1893), IV. 68–69; F. Bancroft, *Life of Seward* (1900), II. 345; W. H. Seward, *Autobiography* (1891), III. 85.

[15] Russell to Lyons, Apr. 26, May 2, 1862, Russell MSS.; London *Times,* May 24, 1862; Hansard, *Parl. Debates,* ser. 3, May 20, 26, 1862, cols. 1957–1959, 2179–2181.

one could not have too much of such a good thing, Brougham suggested extending the zone of search to include other plague spots as well. This was done with regard to the seas around Porto Rico and Madagascar in February, 1863, when, after the intervening *Alabama* controversy had died down, British opinion, coached by the abolition societies, had begun definitely to favor the Northern cause.[16] By this time the Washington treaty was in operation: the mixed commission courts had been set up, warrants issued to cruisers, and a small controversy over the interpretation of the conceded right of search settled.

Gideon Welles, the efficient American Secretary of the Navy, mistrusted Seward, and thought the British foreign office had bluffed him into surrendering the American claim to search British blockade runners off the Southern coasts. He argued that since permission to search was confined by the treaty to certain areas, American vessels furnished with warrants under it would be able within those seas to stop only vessels suspected of slave trading. The foreign office could not believe that his objection to issuing instructions was sincere; but Lyons, in order to discover what the trouble really was, entertained the assistant-secretary of the navy at dinner, and promised to declare that the powers given by the slave trade treaty were added to belligerent rights, not substituted for them. When this declaration had been officially made, Welles offered no further obstructions. Yet he continued to suspect the purity of Britain's motives in securing the convention, and long after the Civil War was over attacked his old colleague, Seward, for his supposed subservience to British interests.[17]

Although search warrants were issued early in 1863 to ten American warships cruising in West Indian waters, and to the solitary corvette off West Africa, the United States was unable to detach any squadron for the special work of suppression until the war was over. No objection was made, however, to British cruisers acting in its absence. This understanding was really all that Britain required to complete her search system. No flag was now immune from the attentions of her West African squadron. Even before the American warrants reached them in November, 1862, the cruisers had been instructed to arrest without

[16] *Parl. Papers* [Command 3129], H. C., 1863, LXXI. 1. The concluding of the treaty had perhaps only a slight, but nevertheless valuable, influence on British opinion, but its practical success is beyond question. *Cf.* E. D. Adams, *Great Britain and the American Civil War* (1925), II. 90.

[17] Welles, *Diary*, II. 163, 166, 192–193; 236; Welles to Seward, Dec. 2, Seward to Lyons, Dec. 3 (unofficial), Lyons to Russell, Dec. 8, 1862 (confidential), F. O. 115/312; Lyons to Seward, Jan. 26, 1863, F. O. 84/1202; Welles, *Lincoln and Seward*, pp. 132 ff.

hesitation all slavers under the Stars and Stripes.[18] The effect on the Cuban traffic was at once evident. The number of slaves illegally introduced into the island between September 30, 1859, and September 30, 1860, had been computed at 30,473 persons; and during the following year the figures were still 23,964. In 1861 to 1862 they dropped to 11,254; in 1862–1863 to 7507; in 1863–1864 to 6807, of whom 3974 were rescued after landing by the Cuban authorities. Finally in 1864–1865, the last year of the Civil War, the numbers had shrunk to 143 only, all of whom were rescued.[19]

This striking decrease was not solely attributable to the disappearance of the American flag from the traffic. When Spain realized that the United States would no longer lend her moral support to the Cuban slave trade, she herself made a more determined effort to check it by appointing a captain-general of Cuba with a real enthusiasm for suppression and with the assistance of the home government.[20] Henceforward, though the traffic in men continued so long as Cuban slavery begot a demand for slaves, it was a hole and corner affair. Reforming statesmen were able to devote their attention to the internal slave trading of Africa and the Arab traffic on the East Coast. Strongest evidence of all that the Lyons-Seward treaty had achieved its object is the fact that not a single slaver was ever tried in the mixed commission courts set up under it.[21] In 1870, two years before it was due, under Seward's clause, to expire, a new convention did away with them. By that time the transatlantic slave trade had virtually disappeared.

University College, London. A. Taylor Milne.

I.[22]

Foreign Office
February 28, 1862.

My Lord,

Mr. Adams spoke to me a few days ago on the subject of the African Slave Trade. He deplored the vigour and success with which the traffic is carried

[18] On the strength of the Lyons-Seward memorandum. France had her own West African squadron, but permitted the verification of a ship's nationality by British gunboats.

[19] Minute by Wylde, chief of the Slave Trade Department at the foreign office, F. O. 84/1215.

[20] Consul Bunch to Russell, Havana, Sept. 30, 1865, F. O. 84/1236.

[21] J. B. Moore, *Digest of International Law* (Washington, 1906), II. 467, n. C; *Parl. Papers* [Command 3490], H. C., 1865, LVI., Return of Cases tried in the Mixed Commission Courts . . . since 1860.

[22] Russell to Lyons, Slave Trade, no. 4, F. O. 115/307. The original letters from Earl Russell to Lord Lyons are all in this volume of the Washington legation archives. F. O. 84/1170 contains drafts and copies kept in London. There is a draft of this letter in Russell's own handwriting.

on at Cuba, and placed in my hands a Despatch from the United States Consul at Havana, of which I enclose a Copy.

This information had previously reached Her Majesty's Government from Her Majesty's Consul at Havana.

Mr. Adams went on to say, that the Government of the United States would be glad to see our Cruizers sent to the Coast of Cuba.

I did not give any formal answer, but said, "that the difficulty lay in the Question of the Right of Search, upon which so much Correspondence has taken place".

The United States are bound by Treaty to have a Squadron with 80 guns on the Coast of Africa to intercept and prevent the Slave Trade: They have now only one vessel of 22 Guns.

I know the United States Minister excuses this non-fulfilment of Treaty, on the ground of the necessity of blockading the coast of the Southern States, and thus the Blockade of the Southern Ports, which inflicts gross and serious injury on British Commerce and manufactures, is made a Reason by the United States Government for not fulfilling their Engagements towards Great Britain in a matter in regard to which the British nation have long taken the most lively Interest.

The result is that American Cruizers are taken away from the African coast on the ground of the Civil War, while British Cruizers are kept away from the Cuban Coast in deference to American jealousy with respect to the United States Flag.

I am well aware that Mr. Seward has told you, as Mr. Adams has told me, that the American Government have no objection to the overhauling of American ships by British Cruizers, provided there exist good grounds of suspicion.

But a verbal Agreement of this kind might be of little avail against a popular cry, founded on the indisputable doctrine of International Law, that the Right of Search cannot be lawfully exercised in time of Peace.

The only alternative I can perceive, is, that the United States Government should either keep up their Squadron of 80 Guns on the Coast of Africa, with a sufficient number of Cruizers on the Coast of Cuba, or that the United States should give their Consent to an efficient Slave Trade Treaty.

I send you a Draft of a Treaty for that purpose.

It is true that the United States by agreeing to this Treaty would not be relieved from the formal obligations of the Treaty of 1842, by which she is bound to keep a Squadron with a fixed number of Guns on the Coast of Africa.

But the proposed Treaty would enable British Men of War to supply, to a certain degree, the want of American Cruizers.

In any event it would befit the United States to join in the most vigorous measures for the suppression of the Traffic in Slaves.

I am [etc.]

RUSSELL.

The Lord Lyons, K. C. B.

II.[23]

Foreign Office,
February 28, 1862.

My Lord,

Your Lordship's Dispatches Slave Trade Nos. 1 and 2 of the 11th Instant, reporting the substance of a conversation which you had with Mr. Seward, relative to the search and capture by British Cruizers of American Vessels engaged in the Slave Trade, have impressed my mind still more strongly than before, with the necessity of some Agreement in the shape of a formal Convention upon this Subject.

Giving full credit to Mr. Seward for his sincerity, I cannot but feel apprehensive that upon the appearance of a British Cruizer in the Port of New York, with a Slaver as a Prize, much ingenuity would be exercised, to show that the Slaver had been subjected to search and capture, without regard to Law or Treaty.

I should be sorry to give such a pretext for Agitation and ill-will.

I hope to send you, by the present Mail, the outline of a Convention which would make the Relations of the two Countries clear, and contribute greatly to the Suppression of the Slave Trade.

I am [etc.]

RUSSELL.

The Lord Lyons, K. C. B.

III.[24]

S. T. Foreign Office,
March 1st, 1862.

My Lord,

With reference to my despatch Slave Trade No. 4. of the 28 Ultimo transmitting to you the Draft of a Treaty between Great Britain and the United States for the suppression of the Slave Trade, I have to state to you that so much ill feeling has been created at different times by the exercise of a Right of Visit on the part of British Cruizers that Her Majesty's Government deem that it would be very inexpedient to instruct the Lords of the Admiralty to sanction any practice of overhauling American Merchant Ships suspected to be Slavers on the mere Authority of an informal Agreement with the Secretary of State of the United States.

At the same time Her Majesty's Government are fully convinced of the sincerity of the United States Government in their professions of a desire to suppress the Slave Trade. This desire is in conformity with the well known sentiment of the President and the principal Members of his Administration.

But, if such is the case, it is much to be desired that the rules of proceeding for the Men of War of the two Nations should be clear and precise.

By this means all dispute on the rights of Naval Commanders to visit and search Vessels may be avoided.

With this view I have had drawn up the Draft Treaty of which I desire you to give a Copy to Mr. Seward.

[23] Russell to Lyons, Slave Trade, no. 5, F. O. 115/307. Rough draft in F. O. 84/1170 in Russell's own handwriting.

[24] Russell to Lyons, Slave Trade, no. 6, F. O. 115/307.

If he is willing to entertain the subject, you can then discuss with him its various provisions.

I am [etc.]

RUSSELL.

The Lord Lyons, K. C. B.

IV.[25]

Washington,
March 15, 1862.

My Lord, I had this morning the honour to receive Your Lordship's despatches of the 25th ultimo, marked "Slave Trade" Nos. 4 and 5, and Your Lordship's Dispatch of the 1st instant marked "Slave Trade" No. 6. I have since seen Mr. Seward and have spoken to him, in the sense of those Despatches, on the subject of the search and capture by British Cruizers of American Vessels engaged in the Slave Trade. I said to Mr. Seward that in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government the only mode of providing for the safe and lawful exercise of a power to effect such searches and captures, would be the conclusion of an efficient Slave Trade Treaty between the two Countries; and I put into his hands the Draft of such a Treaty which was inclosed in your Lordship's No. 4 already referred to.

Mr. Seward appeared to doubt its being advisable to enter at the present moment into negotiations for the conclusion of a Treaty. He said, however, that he would consider the matter. He observed that the occupation of the Coast of the Southern States by the Federal troops would, he supposed, soon very much diminish the number of ships required to maintain the Blockade and would thus enable this Government to employ an efficient Squadron in operations against the Slave Trade.

I have [etc.]

LYONS.

V.

[Confidential]

Washington. March 21, 1862.

My Lord, I have to-day had the honor to despatch to your Lordship a telegram, in cypher, in the following words:

"Mr. Seward is willing to propose to me to negotiate a Slave Trade Treaty, provided the proposal have the air of coming originally from the United States, instead of from us. I have agreed to this. It may therefore be well not to mention that we have already made a proposal. Mr. Seward says he shall propose stipulations not materially differing from those in your Draft. Washington March twenty one."

I have [etc.]

LYONS.

VI.[26]

[Confidential]

Washington March 25, 1862.

My Lord, In my despatch of the 15th Instant marked "Slave Trade" No. 5, I had the honour to inform Your Lordship that I had placed in Mr. Seward's hands the Draft of the Slave Trade Treaty, which was transmitted to me in Your Lordship's Despatch of the 28th Ultimo marked "Slave Trade" No. 4.

[25] All the letters from Lyons to Russell which follow are in this volume, F. O. 84/1171.

[26] The reply to this letter is no. XI.

On the 21st Instant Mr. Seward told me that he had brought the question of concluding such a Treaty as that proposed before the President and Cabinet. Finding the President and Cabinet to be warmly in favour of doing so, he had proceeded to sound influential Senators on the subject.

The result was that he had been led to believe that there was at this moment a probability that the ratification of the Senate might be obtained. One point, however, he deemed essential to success. The proposal must originate with the United States. The great majority, if not all, of the present Senators were strongly opposed to Slavery and the Slave Trade. But there were no doubt many who retained the old jealousy of Great Britain on the Subject of the Right of Search. They would resist all appearance of conceding anything on this subject to pressure from the British Government. But the question would present itself in a different aspect,—if it should be Great Britain that acceded to a requisition from the United States,—if it should appear that the proposal had been made spontaneously by the American Government from its own desire to suppress the African Slave Trade.

Mr. Seward went on to say that if I was willing to receive the proposal as coming spontaneously from him, and if I considered that I had authority to enter into negotiations on that footing, he would at once make the proposal to me formally in writing, and would have a Draft of a Treaty prepared to submit to me.

I answered that I had no hesitation in agreeing that the proposal should originate with the Government of the United States. Her Majesty's Government could only regard this as conveying a more decided expression of the views of the Government of the United States, than would be given by a simple assent to a request from Great Britain. I should receive the written proposal with very great satisfaction and should immediately declare I was ready to enter upon the negotiations—of course, however, it would be impossible for me to say how far I could proceed without further instructions from Your Lordship, until I had seen and considered the Draft which he proposed sending to me.

Mr. Seward said that there were some changes principally of form which would, he thought, be necessary, but that his Draft would not differ materially from that which I had given him. He appeared to think that with a view to obtaining the ratification of the Senate it was very important to seize the present moment, and bring a Treaty regularly concluded, before that Body as soon as possible. I shall, nevertheless, be very reluctant to sign any Treaty without further instructions from Your Lordship, except one differing only in unimportant matters of form, from your Lordship's Draft. It is quite true that so favourable a conjuncture of circumstances as the present is not likely to occur again; and that it may be of very short duration. The events of the War will produce rapid changes in public opinion and in the policy of the Government on the subject of Slavery. It must be remembered that hostility to the Slave Trade is not separated, at all events by the People in general, from the advocacy of the immediate abolition of Slavery in the Country itself. If the progress of the War be slow or unprosperous, influence will be gained by the Party who desire to keep all questions concerning Slavery in the back-ground, in order to render an accommodation with the South more easy. Even at the present moment there can be little doubt that the Anti-Slavery sentiment is stronger in Congress than among the People at large. As the season of the Elections draws near, Members will become more anxious

to ascertain and to follow the feeling prevailing among their constituents. Just now the majority of the Senators are what is termed abolitionists. The opponents of abolition in the Senate are likely to endeavour to conciliate and disarm their antagonists by endeavouring to establish the almost forgotten distinction between Internal Slavery and the Slave Trade, and by making a show of zeal against the latter. This might procure several votes for a Slave-Trade Treaty which would at another time be given against one, and as it requires a majority of two-thirds to pass a Treaty every vote is of consequence. To all these considerations I may add that violent irritation against England has for the moment subsided. The publication of the Correspondence laid before Parliament has indeed produced a kind of reaction against the unworthy suspicions and violent animosity lately prevalent. But a small matter might revive these feelings and make the ratification of a Slave Trade Treaty with us impossible.

Taking all these circumstances into consideration, I think your Lordship will wish me to take advantage of this favourable opportunity, if it be possible to do so. If therefore Mr. Seward is willing to conclude a Treaty which secures the great object of establishing a mutual right to search and detain Slavers, and which does not, to the best of my judgment, contain anything seriously objectionable, I shall be ready to assume the responsibility of signing it at once, in virtue of the general Full Powers transmitted to me with Your Lordship's despatch No. 19 of the 18th July, 1859. I shall have the less hesitation in doing so because as it is the practice of the Senate of the United States not simply to accept or to reject but also to amend and alter Treaties already signed when submitted for its ratification, no offence, could reasonably be taken if Her Majesty's Government should pursue the same course. I shall not, however, affix my signature without further instruction from Your Lordship, unless I shall be convinced that any delay in submitting the Treaty to the Senate would materially diminish the probability of its being ratified.

Mr. Seward, at the conclusion of our conversation, said that he supposed no question would be raised by Great Britain on the present occasion similar to that which had been fatal to the negotiation for the adherence of the United States to the Declaration of the Congress of Paris on Maritime Law. If there was to be any question of a Declaration such as that which Your Lordship and M. Thouvenel had proposed to make previous to affixing your signatures to a convention on that subject, it would be much better not to enter upon any negotiation. I replied that I could not conceive that there could be the least cause for apprehension on this point. It was absolutely necessary at the time at which the negotiation respecting maritime rights took place, to prevent misunderstanding on a practical question which could not be avoided. The British and French Governments could not bind themselves to treat the Southern Privateers as Pirates, and it would have been a breach of good faith to leave any doubt on the subject. I could not see that any similar question could possibly arise with regard to the proposed Slave Trade Treaty. Mr. Seward said that he was of the same opinion, but that he had thought it prudent just to mention the matter.

Mr. Seward particularly requested me to consider the whole of our conversation as confidential.

I have [etc.]

LYONS.

VII.[27]

[Confidential]

Washington March 28th, 1862.

My Lord, Mr. Seward sent to me the day before yesterday the promised Draft of a Treaty for the suppression of the Slave Trade. He accompanied it with an informal Note, of which I enclose a copy, and at the same time returned to me the Draft transmitted to me by Your Lordship which I had in obedience to your orders placed in his hands. Mr. Seward's Draft is copied verbatim from Your Lordship's. But a clause is added to the last article reserving to each Party the right of putting an end to the Treaty after the expiration of ten years, on giving a year's note of the intention to do so.

I went to see Mr. Seward yesterday and asked what had been his object in adding this clause, and whether he attached any great importance to it. I said that certainly in my opinion the Treaty would be very much better without it; but that if he thought it essential in order to obtain the ratification of the Senate, I should be unwilling to insist so strongly upon its being obliterated, as to bring the whole Treaty into jeopardy, or even to cause any great delay.

Mr. Seward answered that for his own part he should very much prefer a Treaty of unlimited duration; and that his friends in the Senate took the same view as he did. He had, he said, inserted the Clause in order to disarm opposition, but he should nevertheless be glad that I should state my objection to it in writing. With a note from me to this effect which he could produce, he might be able to get rid of the clause. At any rate such a note would be useful to him. He would suggest, however, that I should say in it, that I did not intend in making the objection to obstruct the progress of the negotiation.

I readily agreed to write Mr. Seward such a note as he proposed. I am very desirous to do anything which may strengthen his hands in carrying the Treaty through the Senate; and my note may be serviceable in this respect, even if it be used only to conciliate opponents by showing that the Government has adhered to the limitation Clause in spite of objection.

I do not think that, so far as practical results are concerned, there will be found much difference, between a Treaty without limitation of time, and a Treaty terminable after Ten Years. At all events I am persuaded that Your Lordship will consider that a very great object will be attained if we can succeed in establishing for ten years certain stipulations essential to the success of our efforts to put down the Slave Trade. I feel confident that Your Lordship will not be disposed to blame me, if I assume the responsibility of signing a Treaty in accordance with your Draft, whether with, or without, the addition of a limitation Clause.

Mr. Seward requested me to be mindful in my written communications with him that the proposal to conclude the Treaty was to be regarded as having originated with the Government of the United States.

I have [etc.]

LYONS.

[27] Russell sent a note approving of Lyons's proceedings as described in this dispatch, Russell to Lyons, no. 10, Apr. 17, 1862 (confidential), F. O. 115/307.

VIII.[28]

Washington March 26/ 1862.

Enclosure. Copy. Mr. Seward presents his compliments to Lord Lyons, and has the honour to submit to his consideration the enclosed Draft of a proposed Treaty and annexes, between the United States and Great Britain for the suppression of the African Slave Trade, which is the same as the original Draft submitted by his Lordship, with the exception of an additional Clause providing for the duration of the Treaty.

Washington, March 26th 1862.

IX.

[Confidential]

Washington,
March 31, 1862.

My Lord, Mr. Seward told me this morning that he had come to the conclusion that his best course would be to insist upon the clause limiting the duration of the proposed Treaty for the suppression of the Slave Trade. He would, he said, accordingly answer in that sense my note of the 28th instant. He thought that the correspondence would thus materially assist his endeavours to obtain the ratification of the Senate. If the Anti-Slavery Party were strong enough they might carry an amendment expunging the clause—and to this he should readily agree. On the other hand, the clause itself, and his perserverance in retaining it, might obtain votes for the Treaty from the other Party, if votes from that Party were required.

Mr. Seward's long experience of the Senate, and his well-known tact in dealing with that Body, gives his opinion on such a point so much weight, that I naturally thought it prudent to be guided by it. I therefore made no objection to his taking his own course. I do not, as Your Lordship is aware, consider the limiting Clause as likely to be of much practical importance one way or the other, and I think you would be unwilling that I should throw away a chance which is not likely to occur again of attaining the object at which we have so long aimed.

I have [etc.]

LYONS.

X.

[Confidential]

Washington April 7th, 1862.

My Lord, Since I had the Honor to address to your Lordship my Despatches of the 31st ultimo marked "Slave Trade Nos. 11 & 12" I have been in frequent communication with Mr. Seward on the subject of the proposed Treaty for the suppression of the Slave Trade. Mr. Seward has constantly urged the importance of bringing the Treaty before the Senate as soon as possible. He has expressed a very positive opinion that it would be hazardous to incur the delay necessary to enable me to receive further instructions from Your Lordship. He has stated that while confident of obtaining the Ratification of the Senate at this moment, he cannot feel so certain that he should be able to do so a month hence. He has continued to be of opinion that it is important that the Treaty should go to the Senate with the Clause making it terminable by either party, on giving notice after the expiration of ten years.

[28] Original in F. O. 115/309, together with Seward's formal letters of March 22 and April 24, 1862.

I am not so sanguine, as Mr. Seward appears to be, about obtaining the Ratification of the Senate now, but I am still more strongly, than he is, of opinion that the probability of doing so is greater at this moment than it is ever likely to be again. I have accordingly this morning signed the Treaty; and I have, in deference to Mr. Seward's opinion, admitted the Clause limiting the duration. In other respects the Treaty, as signed, differs very little from the Draft as transmitted to me with Your Lordship's Despatch of the 28th of February (Slave Trade No. 4).

It has been found necessary to make a slight change in the wording of Article IX. of the Treaty itself, in order to correct a grammatical error. I inclose herewith the Article as amended.

The Blank left in the Third Section of Article IX. of Annex B has been filled up with the words:

"The Judge of the United States for the Southern District of New York".

The Blanks in the Ratification article (XII.) have been so filled up that the Article provides that the Ratifications shall be exchanged in *London,* and in *six months,* or sooner if possible.

With the exception of these particulars, the Treaty which I have signed is identical word for word, with Your Lordship's Draft. I shall transmit the original to Your Lordship to-day with another Despatch.

The mode of procedure of the United States' Senate, with regard to Treaties, appeared to render it desirable to fix a rather long period for the exchange of the Ratifications, and to provide that it should be made in London rather than at Washington. For the Senate does not always confine itself to ratifying or rejecting a Treaty absolutely. It very frequently makes amendments or alterations. It appears, therefore, to be more consistent with the Dignity of the Queen, that even if Her Majesty approve of the Treaty as it stands, Her Ratification should not be given, until it is certain that the President has been authorised by the Senate to give the Ratification of the United States.

I have [etc.]

LYONS.

XI.[29]

[Confidential]

Foreign Office,
April 10, 1862.

My Lord,

I have received Your Despatch, Slave Trade No. 7 of the 25th Ultimo, marked Confidential, reporting that the Cabinet of Washington would not be unwilling to enter into Negotiations with Her Majesty's Government for the conclusion of a Treaty for the suppression of the African Slave Trade, provided that it should be made to appear that the overtures for such a Treaty originated with the Government of the United States, and not with Her Majesty's Government; the President and Mr. Seward being of opinion that this course is essentially necessary in order to ensure the consent of the Senate to the Treaty.

I have to acquaint you, that the object of Her Majesty's Government being the suppression of the Slave Trade, it is immaterial to them, whether the Proposals for a Treaty with the United States Government to affect this ob-

[29] Russell to Lyons, F. O. 115/307.

ject, are made to appear as originating with the Cabinet of Washington, or, as they really did, with the Government of Her Majesty, and I therefore approve the language held by you to Mr. Seward on this subject, as reported in your Despatch.

I am [etc.]

RUSSELL.

The Lord Lyons, K. C. B.

XII.

Washington April 25th, 1862.

My Lord, I have this day sent by telegraph to Portland, in order that it may be conveyed to England by the Packet which leaves that place tomorrow, the following message addressed to Your Lordship:—

The Slave Trade Treaty signed by Mr. Seward and me on the seventh has been passed unanimously without amendment by the Senate. The Ratification of the United States will be sent to London as soon as it can be written out. Washington April Twenty five.

I have [etc.]

LYONS.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS

Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences. Editor-in-Chief, EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN; Associate Editor, ALVIN JOHNSON. Volumes VII., VIII. *Gossen-Labor Turnover.* (New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xxvi, 722; xxii, 713. $7.50 each.)

THE two volumes under review contain some 668 articles written by 604 different authors. The number and the geographical distribution of the writers is impressive. As usual there are many brief biographical sketches. The historian will find particularly useful, among the longer articles, the series dealing with historiography from classical antiquity to the present and including that of China, Japan, and India. Valuable also are summaries of the characteristics of the political arrangements within the British empire and of the governments of the principal nations. Other outstanding groups of articles are those on industrialism, internationalism, and labor. There is abundant evidence that the work is maintaining its high standard of scholarship. The editing is intelligent and the proofreading conscientious.

Students of contemporary thought will find a convenient source in the *Encyclopaedia.* Revolutionary ideology is practically absent from the two volumes under review, but again and again appear emphatic statements of present perplexities regarding social and political problems accompanied by intimations of hope of evolutionary progress. A few examples will illustrate the type of thinking that finds expression in the *Encyclopaedia.* "If the transition to a new political order is to be accomplished by a process of political evolution rather than social revolution . . . the state must come to be viewed as only one of many human societies. . . . Its attitude of sovereignty must be abandoned" (article on Government). "One may doubt whether international collaboration is feasible among states some of which are democratic, some Fascist, some communist. But despite the difficulties inherent in the task new organs of international direction and control must somehow be evolved to keep pace with the triumphs of mechanical efficiency" (Internationalism). "The return of *laissez faire* is impossible. . . . It seems that industrialism has now reached the stage at which its fuller development requires above all else coherent planning and unified control from the standpoint of consumption as well as of productive technique" (Industrialism). "In some countries the prevailing trend even of the state is anti-intellectual . . . The influence of the intelligentsia upon the mass remains superficial" (Intellectuals). These selections set forth some of the more moderate ideas

of the United States and Western Europe. The ideology of Russia, of Asia, and of the Western hemisphere south of the Rio Grande finds almost no direct expression in these volumes, which deal with such inclusive subjects as internationalism, imperialism, and government. The single contributor from Latin America presents only a short biographical sketch. The article on the Kuomintang instead of being written by a Chinese intellectual appears over the signature of two Westerners from Nanking University. The long discussion of the Indian question is written by an Englishman. In such a selection of authors the volumes reflect the provincialism of Western civilization.

A familiar warning, which the editors might well have called to mind before deciding to limit their contributors virtually to representatives of Western culture, is repeated in the general article on History. "It is not purposeful distortion by the partisan disguised as a scholar which is of supreme importance, but the unconscious involuntary distortion, the distortion which the bona fide historian does not even perceive, the error committed by him at the very moment when he feels himself the most rigorously impartial of all observers." The authors of this article, Henri Berr and Lucien Febvre, have more hope than many moderns that this fundamental defect of scholarship can be overcome. "The only possible remedy consists in the progressive broadening of history, in the replacement of particular histories by the broad and salutary idea of a universal history, of which all particular histories are chapters. For the final goal of the historian is not to make known certain groups of men at certain periods, but humanity in the totality of its representatives." The ideal is stimulating and should be an objective for historians. But the authors do not explain how the individuals who attempt the final grand syntheses can escape from their own mental limitations.

Yale University. RALPH H. GABRIEL.

BOOKS OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition. By CHARLES ALEXANDER ROBINSON, JR., Assistant Professor of Greek and Latin Classics, Brown University. [Brown University Studies.] (Providence: Brown University. 1932. Pp. 81. $3.00.)

THIS book is essentially an examination into the source material used by the later historians of Alexander the Great. In comparing the place-names along the itinerary of Alexander mentioned by Arrian, Diodorus, Justin, Curtius, and Plutarch, Robinson is able to show that the five accounts are in substantial agreement for the period from the beginning of the Asiatic campaign to 327; that there is confusion in the records from 327 to the second arrival at the Hydaspes in 326; and that the several histories are again in agreement from this point until the death of Alexander in 323. The evidence

is presented in tabular form for greater ease of comparative study and interpretation. In convincing manner, Robinson argues that the evidence for the first period was drawn from the history of Callisthenes of Olynthus which was based in turn on the daily journal of the expedition (ephemerides) kept by Eumenes of Cardia and Diodotus of Erythrae. After the death of Callisthenes there was no official historian with the expedition, and even the records of the journal were burned in 326. This accounts for the divergence among later historians, who had no authoritative source for this second period. For the final period the journal records were again available, and their use explains the uniform record of the later itinerary as given by the historians. The general plan of the argument here advanced by Robinson was outlined by W. K. Prentice in *Transactions* of the American Philological Association LIV. (1923) 74–85, but Robinson has stated the case more fully and reached new determinations.

As an appendix to the book is an article entitled When did Alexander reach the Hindu Kush? which first appeared in the *American Journal of Philology,* LI. (1930) 22–31. Here Robinson rightly emphasizes the necessity of following the accounts of Strabo and Arrian, and of assuming that Alexander went into winter quarters in 330/29 just south of the Hindu Kush. He finds it impossible to reconcile this interpretation (which Strabo states as a fact) with the accepted date of the death of Darius in late July or August, 330, and Alexander's departure from the Caspian sea in October. Alexander could not have marched 1300 miles from the Caspian to the Hindu Kush between October and the beginning of winter. So Robinson questions the accuracy of Plutarch's statement that Alexander delayed four months in Persepolis in the spring of 330 and of Arrian's statement that Darius met his death in the Attic month of Hecatombaeon.

But in 330/29, the first year of a Callippic cycle, the month of Hecatombaeon fell early in the Julian year, commencing on June 29 (Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens,* p. 429). Since many unknown quantities and subjective interpretations are involved in making an estimate of Alexander's marches and halts in this year, it seems to the present reviewer quite possible to suppose that Alexander delayed at least approximately four months in Persepolis (Plutarch) and that Darius died early in July (Arrian). Alexander may have spent only a month in campaigns about the Caspian and so have started on his long march to the Hindu Kush in mid-August instead of October. Under such circumstances it is possible to believe that Alexander was at Candahar in November, and that in December, after the setting of the Pleiades, he reached the foot of the Hindu Kush for winter quarters.

A map reproduced from the *Cambridge Ancient History* makes the entire argument of the book easy to follow. Printing and binding have been admirably done. The volume makes a real contribution to the study of Alexander, and is well written and attractively presented.

The University of Michigan. B. D. Meritt.

Geography of Claudius Ptolemy. Translated into English and edited by EDWARD LUTHER STEVENSON, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D. Based upon Greek and Latin Manuscripts and Important Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Century Printed Editions, including Reproductions of the Maps from the Ebner Manuscript, *ca.* 1460. With an Introduction by Professor JOSEPH FISCHER, S.J. (New York: The New York Public Library. 1932. Pp. xvi, 167, 29 map plates. $60.00.)

THIS is the first time that a full translation of Ptolemy's famous *Geography* has been made into English. There have been partial translations but these are quite fragmentary. Perhaps the task of making a full translation has heretofore proved too formidable for those who might otherwise have been interested in it; for as Father Fischer, the world's leading authority on Ptolemy, points out in his scholarly introduction to the present book, the undertaking is beset with difficulties. Fortunately these difficulties did not deter Dr. Stevenson from carrying out the work.

The *Geography* consists of eight books, to which are appended twenty-seven maps. It contains no physical description of the earth or of the countries thereof. In this respect it is inferior to Strabo's work. But Ptolemy was primarily a mathematician and astronomer and his interest therefore lay in the field, not of physical, but of mathematical geography. In Book I. he discusses his aims, principles, and methods. He tells us that his work is based on that of Marinus of Tyre, a geographer unknown to us except through Ptolemy, but he proposes to correct Marinus's many errors, which he holds were largely due to faulty methods. He asserts that the then existing methods of measuring distances and locating positions on the map, based chiefly on travelers' records, were wholly inadequate. They should be supplemented by observations scientifically made with the assistance of astronomical instruments. Books II. to VII. contain tables purporting to show the latitude and longitude of many places throughout the then known world. In Book VII. there is also a description of a map of the whole world as Ptolemy conceived it. In Book VIII. he explains further his methods and lists twenty-six regions into which he has divided the world for purposes of map-making.

The tables naturally constitute a test of the success or failure of Ptolemy's methods. Bunbury, therefore, in his *History of Ancient Geography,* criticizes him rather severely for his many errors in calculation. He says that while Ptolemy emphasized the importance of direct astronomical observations in calculating locations he was actually in a position to use but few of such observations himself. In the main he had to rely on travelers' accounts and other faulty methods used by his predecessors. Bunbury reproaches him for having given "a strictly scientific form to that which did not really rest on a scientific basis". Stevenson, however, points out in his preface that "the remarkable fact is that he was so nearly accurate in his records". And Father

Fischer avers that Ptolemy, "in Books II.–VII., has listed some 8000 locations determined with apparent accuracy down to five minutes".

In any case, whatever the defects of Ptolemy's calculations may be, "the whole of modern cartography has developed from his Atlas". It is therefore peculiarly appropriate that the Atlas should be translated by America's foremost student of cartography. In the present volume Dr. Stevenson has maintained his standards as a scholar and a producer of fine books. His translation has been made with painstaking care and with due consideration for the discrepancies in the texts of the various Ptolemy manuscripts. A certain awkwardness of expression here and there detracts but little from its general excellence. Twenty-seven maps are reproduced from the New York Public Library's celebrated and almost priceless Ebner manuscript, the maps of which are more accurately made than those of most Ptolemy manuscripts. Regarding the question whether the originals were actually Ptolemy's work, Father Fischer holds that twenty-six of them were, while the world map, the one map most generally attributed to Ptolemy, was the work of the Alexandrian geographer, Agathodämon. The whole volume is an excellent example of the bookmaker's art: paper of the best handmade quality, beautiful printing, a fine half-leather binding. For this workmanship the New York Public Library shares with Dr. Stevenson the credit. The price, it may be added, is proportionately high. But it would have been impossible to reproduce the maps satisfactorily in a cheap edition.

Ptolemy's *Geography* remains to-day a more important source for historical research than is generally realized. No careful study of the place-names mapped out by him has ever been made though it might shed significant light on important problems of Ancient history. Nor has any thorough study of Ptolemy's influence on the discoverers and explorers of early modern times yet been worked out. In the neglected field of historical geography the Atlas is an invaluable source. Scholars who choose to work along any of the lines here suggested will find Dr. Stevenson's volume a useful adjunct to their labors.

New York University. JONATHAN F. SCOTT.

Cinq Années de Recherches Archéologiques en Éthiopie: Province du Harar et Éthiopie Méridionale. Par R. B. AZAÏS ET R. CHAMBARD. Préface par EDMOND POTTIER, Membre de l'Institut. *Texte* and *Atlas.* (Paris: Librairie Geuthner. 1932. Pp. xv, 348. 350 fr.)

IN 1927, while Acting Director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, the present reviewer was fortunate in having as his guests the authors of the above work, P. Bernardin Azaïs and Mr. Roger Chambard. With their permission I published a short statement of their explorations in southern Abyssinia (*Art and Archaeology,* July, 1927). The

present volumes contain a complete account of the five expeditions. The results are presented not in a didactic form but in the form of a diary which makes the material easily intelligible for the average reader. The plates consisting mostly of photographs are beautifully executed. Several appendixes are contributed by specialists: Paul Ravaisse gives the translation of the Arabic inscriptions discovered in the Harar; P. Lester interprets the anthropological data furnished by the explorers; Jean Cottreau analyzes and classifies the fossils secured.

Southern Abyssinia is still a land of mystery, especially in as far as its prehistoric phase is concerned. It was the merit as well as the good fortune of P. Azaïs and of his companion to discover an abundance of material which was hardly expected in those remote regions and which tends to link the ancient civilization of southern Abyssinia with that of the Mediterranean Basin. The relationship seems to be beyond doubt but whether the influence has been exercised from North to South or South to North remains to be seen.

Dolmens of the same type as those found in Europe and Asia, were discovered in the region of Harar; funerary tumuli in the country of the Guraghe. In the region of the great lakes were observed menhirs resembling those found in some sections of France. In the province of Soddo, the explorers found funerary slabs roughly in the shape of human figures, some ornamented with geometrical designs and others with daggers in relief. Near Lake Margherita, they discovered several thousands of phallic pillars, very crude and realistic, many of them with solar symbols. The same type is found in various sections of Africa, for example, in the Cameroon and in the French Congo. Finally in the Orono country four statues came to light which the authors declare to be the most sensational find of the five expeditions (pp. 236 ff.). These four statues remind one of the so called Ægean Goddess, guardian and protectress of the tombs. What conclusions will eventually be drawn from these sensational finds, it is still hard to say, but this abundant material must be taken into consideration in all future prehistoric work.

Besides these data of a more archæological nature, the authors have gathered an immense harvest of first-hand information on the various tribes which they visited; their domestic, social, and religious customs and habits. Accurate descriptions of the country are given, which should prove of the highest value to future travelers, as also to geographers.

We cannot close this review without mentioning the fact that the success of the expedition was made possible by the manifold interest of Negus Taffari, then regent and now crowned emperor under the name of Hayle Sellasie I., and by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres which has encouraged and helped materially P. Azaïs in his researches.

The Catholic University of America. R. Butin.

Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds. Edited by D. C. Douglas, Lecturer in Medieval History to the University of Glasgow. [The British Academy, Records of the Social and Economic History of England and Wales, volume VIII.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1932. Pp. clxxi, 247. $10.00.)

A long introduction to this volume of Bury St. Edmunds documents gives the latest results of Mr. Douglas's penetrating study of East Anglian society. It gives also certain important suggestions as to the general method of compilation of Domesday Book and the intent of the Conqueror in the administration of his new kingdom, and the application to it of a uniform feudal policy. It is interesting that Mr. Douglas's volume should so nearly coincide in date of publication with Professor Stenton's work on early English feudalism. The most important of the documents published by Mr. Douglas is the Feudal Book of Abbot Baldwin, contained in the Black Book of the abbey in the Cambridge University Library. The Feudal Book claims to be a description of the conditions that were in existence on the lands of St. Edmunds at the time when William I. made his *descriptio tocius Anglie,* and also at the death of that king. It is, therefore, practically contemporary with Domesday, and is dated by the deaths, respectively, of William, September 7, 1087, and of Abbot Baldwin, probably January 4, 1098. It is thus established as another of those documents, contemporary or almost contemporary, with Domesday, like the *Inquisicio Eliensis* and the *Domesday Monachorum,* whose great importance was first emphasized by Round. In the case of the Feudal Book, "similarities . . . between the phraseology of the two records come from a common knowledge on the part of the compilers, both of the Feudal Book and of Domesday Book, of the original Domesday returns", namely, the returns from which our Domesday was compiled. Such documents as the Feudal Book suggest to Mr. Douglas the possibility that the greater ecclesiastical tenants in chief may have furnished private surveys of their lands preliminary to Domesday, including therein the results of *clamores,* the pleas relating to their lands, which form so important an element of Domesday. The Feudal Book thus becomes for Mr. Douglas a clue to much that is obscure in Domesday compilation—the time required for the completion of the great survey, the earlier completion of Little Domesday, the composition of the original returns.

Even more important, perhaps—if anything can be more important in early English history than light thrown on Domesday itself—is the evidence afforded by the documents with regard to the policy of the early Norman kings, and the effect of the Conquest on English society. Mr. Douglas discusses the "wedge" of new men enfeoffed on Bury lands, inserted, as it were, between the church and the older church tenants. These *feudati homines* were military tenants, bearing probably some relation to the constabulary of

the feudal host stressed by Round. They in turn constructed new military fees on their lands, sometimes enfeoffing royal nominees. Thus arose an order of men, not necessarily as yet an hereditary social rank, some of whom invite a comparison with the *ministeriales* of the Continent. On the lower classes in Bury lands, on the other hand, Mr. Douglas believes the effect of the Conquest to have been slight. The depression of peasants from the free peasants listed in the Feudal Book he would defer till the thirteenth century. Such conclusions are not, of course, applicable to other parts of England where the Scandinavian element was less strong and manorialization had progressed further. It becomes increasingly clear from the trend of modern scholarship that we can no longer speak of English society in a given century: we are concerned, rather, as Mr. Douglas remarks, "with a number of diverse social structures, varying greatly from district to district". The interest lies in seeing how uniform a policy the Conqueror tried to apply in different regions and to different conditions.

The charters in the volume are chosen because they fall in the main in the period from 1066 to 1180. Some of them have already been printed in the *Regesta* and elsewhere. They are carefully collated with the texts in the many cartularies available. Evidence is shown of the evolution of the Norman royal charter from the Anglo-Saxon writ, and the different styles of royal and private charters are discussed. The reader is perhaps unduly exigent in wishing that the editor had told us more of the great abbey itself as well as of Abbot Baldwin, but those of us who feel the charm of following dark clues to obscure origins will be grateful to Mr. Douglas for a very suggestive treatment of a restricted district at a crucial moment in its history.

Mt. Holyoke College. N. Neilson.

Glanvill, De Legibus et Consuetudinibus Regni Angliæ. Edited by George E. Woodbine, George Burton Adams Professor of History in Yale University and Professor of Legal History in the Yale School of Law. [Yale Historical Publications, Manuscripts and Edited Texts, XIII.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1932. Pp. ix, 306. $4.00.)

"A new edition is wanted", wrote Maitland thirty-seven years ago in speaking of Glanvill's *De Legibus,* and a new edition had been wanted for many years before. That no competent student undertook it became one of the standing mysteries of English scholarship. Professor Woodbine has at last done the thing as it should be done. That it is an excursus from his life work of editing Bracton is wholly fortunate for his very special knowledge of the later book is just the foreground needed in tracing back to the law and procedure of Glanvill's time and it crops out most usefully all through the notes. From now on we can look upon the editions of the sixteenth, seven-

teenth, and eighteenth centuries as interesting antiquities; and it is to be hoped that we can forget Beames's atrocious translation (1812) and the rather valueless edition by Beale (1900).

Of the many early manuscripts Professor Woodbine finds twenty-seven of some use in establishing a text. These quite accommodatingly group themselves in two families or traditions, which the editor calls *alpha* and *beta*—sixteen in the former and eleven in the latter. These trace back clearly to near 1200, or about fifteen years from the time the treatise was written; but no extant manuscript is the archetype in either tradition. There is such substantial agreement in each of the families that it is seldom difficult to work out a text for each. It is believed that the *beta* edition stands close to the text of the author. Professor Woodbine remarks:

> Taking into consideration all the facts, and especially the direct and almost apologetic statement at the end of the prologue to the effect that the writer has deliberately chosen to employ the plain and crude language of court business (*stilo vulgari et verbis curialibus utens*), the explanation which seems most in accord with these facts is that beta follows, for the most part at least, an original version couched largely in the clear and direct English legal phraseology of the time, while alpha represents a more finished and somewhat expanded version, made, we have some grounds for believing, by an ecclesiastic, possibly a foreigner, who objecting to a too uncouth diction and the technical expressions of the English courts, preferred to improve his text, as he thought, by the use of explanatory phrases and some of the terminology of the ecclesiastical courts.

Yet the *beta* writer knew the language of Roman and canon law as shown by the apparently unconscious way he sometimes inserted words and phrases; he chose to use *verbis curialibus,* he did not have to. A further indication that *alpha* stands further from the original is that the one responsible for it, while conscious that only secular causes were dealt with, does not seem to have grasped clearly the point that these were only such secular causes as came before the king's court. The *alpha* version omits the list of *capitula* after the prologue and inserts rubrics in the text, while *beta* has no rubrics. As would naturally be supposed, the editor follows largely the *beta* version, but the footnotes contain whatever is enlightening in *alpha* or in individual manuscripts of either version. The traditional book and chapter divisions are kept.

The editor speaks modestly of his notes grouped at the end of the book, covering 117 pages: they "are not, and are not intended to be, a commentary on Glanvill". Their main purpose is comparison between Glanvill's statements and what may be gleaned from recorded cases of that general period. But they sometimes go beyond that; they are compact and hold much learning, clearly stated. The debt to authorities on this period, especially Maitland and Adams, is everywhere evident and fully acknowledged; yet the student of English legal history has new things to learn by going through these notes.

It has not been felt necessary to add much to Maitland's classical comments on Glanvill and the treatise which passes under his name, but Professor Woodbine does not think that the laudatory reference to Glanvill in the *Incipit* needs count much against his authorship in view of medieval psychology in such matters. The format of this authoritative edition of England's "first classical text-book" in law is worthy of it.

The University of Minnesota. ALBERT B. WHITE.

The Cambridge Medieval History. Planned by the late J. B. BURY, M. A., F. B. A., Regius Professor of Modern History. Edited by the late J. R. TANNER, Litt. D., C. W. PREVITÉ-ORTON, Litt. D., F. B. A., and Z. N. BROOKE, Litt. D. Volume VII., *Decline of Empire and Papacy.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xxxviii, 1073. $12.00.)

THE present volume covers, roughly speaking, the fourteenth century. There are twenty-six chapters contributed by twenty-two authors. Necessarily there is no rigid adherence to a strict chronological period and the various subjects begin and end at widely different dates. This was unavoidable, for there are included here the story of the Swiss Confederation to 1516, that of the Hansa to the end of the fifteenth century, of the Teutonic order throughout its history, of Wales to 1485, of Ireland only to 1315, and of Scotland to 1328, of Russia 1015–1462, and of the Jews from the beginning of the Middle Ages to the end of the fifteenth century.

The introduction, written by Professor C. W. Previté-Orton, is a thought-provoking discussion of the main characteristics of the fourteenth century. The temptation to quote at length is strong but must be resisted, and a summary cannot do justice to the author's closely compacted statements. He speaks of the "ossifying of regnant ideas which are slowly losing their vitality", yet "in their efforts to perfect and complete", he adds, "they devised much that was new and that was to be fruitful in later times. . .". However "the novel ferment in these creations strained, but did not break the feudal mould which contained them". Though "the century ends with Church and Feudalism and the accepted philosophy of life standing where they did", "yet the fourteenth century is not merely that in which the feudal age moves slowly towards its setting; it is that in which the harbingers appear of the Renaissance and even very dimly of modern times". "The soil trembles under the feudal and ecclesiastical edifice; there are fissures and sudden landslides; but the old order still keeps intact and solid, as if it had been built for eternity."

It is a truism that each age reinterprets the history of the past from its own standpoint. In reading this introduction many statements which reflect a present-day attitude are discovered. To detach these from their context may be somewhat unjust; however, materials that might be used by the

sociologist, if he could be induced to read this volume, can be indicated by a few random selections. Examples of these are: "the ossifying of regnant ideas" already quoted above; "these towns and gilds were at the last resort dependent on 'great commerce'; international exchange, which they could not control and did not understand"; "Their one remedy for failing commerce was privilege and rigid protection"; "The 'democratic' régime had ended in failure"; "the long war had acted as a forcing house for the sentiment of nationality".

The chapters on political history are good and, for the most part, present clear outlines of the main facts. Probably most readers will be more interested in other chapters. Possibly the one of most general interest is that describing Peasant Life and Rural Conditions (*ca.* 1100- *ca.* 1500) by Professor Eileen Power. She had a task which might well seem appalling—to describe conditions varying from district to district throughout Western Europe and constantly in flux. Nevertheless her first sentence is reassuring. "The student of medieval social and economic history who commits himself to a generalization", she writes, "is digging a pit into which he will later assuredly fall, and nowhere does the pit yawn deeper than in the realm of rural history." She also adds the caution against elaborate historical explanations that "are sometimes given for differences which were simply due to geographical conditions" (p. 716). Professor Power's picture of the peasant as a social being is made vivid by a felicitous use of medieval literary and non-legal sources; in a limited space she has demonstrated that the legal historian's view of the peasant can and must be amplified (*cf.* p. 740). One general conclusion is worthy of note: "Indeed the immobile medieval peasant, like the self-sufficing medieval manor, is something of a myth." There is a short discussion of the rising prosperity of the peasant during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and of the less favorable conditions which confronted this class in the succeeding two hundred years. The reconstructions of life in the villages—all too brief—leave a picture very different from the 'textbook manor' where the other tenants "pay and do in all things . . . just as the said Hugh Miller". With such a storehouse from which to draw it is to be hoped that even writers of textbooks may describe the peasant as a real human being.

Professor Johnstone's two chapters on The Last Capetians and Edward I. and Edward II. are excellent. Her common sense and *obiter dicta* are equally noteworthy. Of Philip V. she says, "He was, in fact, exactly the sort of king to win the admiration of the modern historian of administrative and constitutional development, while to the warlike feudalist of his own day, or to the conventionally-minded contemporary chronicler bent on praising the conventionally correct, he was a disappointing figure". Apropos of the differences between Lapsley and Tout, and Davies concerning constitutional questions of the year 1322 in England, Professor Johnstone affirms that "it is just possi-

ble that both interpretations are a little too subtle". Concerning the Model Parliament, she writes that "even scholars who rightly challenge much that used to be said about Edward I.'s parliaments themselves unconsciously take a tone which implies that, even to the thirteenth century, 'parliamentary origins' were of vital interest". It is a welcome relief to find events treated from the standpoint of their age and not used to prove a modern theory. This author is more interested in how the institutions actually worked than in fine-spun theories as to their origins and developments.

The contents of the chapter on Medieval Mysticism by Evelyn Underhill may be summarized in her statement that this "mystical temper profoundly influences religion and art, and instigates both religious rebellion and religious reform". Her careful analysis is an excellent statement of its importance and of its manifestations from the time of St. Romuald to St. Catherine of Genoa (died 1510), described as "a lady of the Renaissance with a genius for the spiritual life. She joins no religious Order, leads no campaign, performs no miracles. . . . In her, mystical religion completes its transition from the medieval to the modern world."

In the chapter on Italy in the Time of Dante, Armstrong had a difficult task and accomplished it in a masterly manner. His lively characterizations of individuals, especially that of Boniface VIII., may be challenged, but probably not successfully. He has handled a tangled mass of material and has presented a clear and interesting account.

The chapter on the Popes of Avignon and the Great Schism by Professor Mollat is one of the most readable. He brings out clearly "the over-centralisation and over-elaboration" of the curia, its claims to "the plentitude of power" in the secular affairs of Europe and its "supremacy in things ecclesiastical" (p. xv). "In no period of history did the Holy See exercise its powers of jurisdiction in so extreme a form" (p. 276).

"In no feature of fourteenth-century society is the working of centralising monarchy on feudal institutions and on conditions increasingly non-feudal better seen than in the development of the assemblies known as Estates." Thus Previté-Orton stresses the importance of the chapter on Medieval Estates, contributed by Professor McIlwain whose main purpose "is to make clear medieval representative institutions and ideas in general, rather than to trace their history in detail". The general opinion will be that he has succeeded. His comparison of England and France and his explanation of Esmein's "apparent paradox" (p. 711) are illuminating. His conclusion is, "whenever constitutionalism arose out of an earlier feudalism, its rise and its continuance alike were conditioned upon a corresponding appearance and participation in government of the medieval Estates or their descendants".

Space does not permit a discussion of other excellent chapters. However, the chapter on the Jews, which is the best summary we possess, is especially worthy of note, as are those on Wyclif and Ireland.

The bibliographies vary greatly in length and in excellence. Though well done, the ones on Germany, France, and England are possibly less useful than are those for other countries, or those for Wyclif, the Jews, Medieval Estates, Peasant Life, and Mysticism, where it is more difficult to find competent guidance. Under chapter XI., page 870, only two titles are given for the trial of the Templars. One of these might well have been omitted. There is no mention of Gmelin's *Schuld oder Unschuld des Templerordens* or of a number of other pertinent works. Under the chapter on Mysticism, Muzzey's *The Spiritual Franciscans* and Eckenstein's *Women under Monasticism* might possibly have been included.

There are eleven maps, three of them colored. Unfortunately, by being bound in, the middle of the double page maps is obscured and it is only with difficulty that they can be used. The usual corrigenda for the preceding volumes are found on page xxi. Tucked away at the bottom of page 975 are addenda to volume II., chapter X.

The editorial supervision has been remarkable. The reason for the two accounts of the expedition of Henry VII. is given in the preface. Caggese (p. 67), Mollat (p. 272 n.), and Underhill (p. 808) are allowed to express different opinions as to the influence of St. Catherine of Siena. The statements about taxation in France (pp. 324, 342) seem not be in entire agreement. The question of the murder of Edward II. is left in doubt on page 432 by Johnstone, but apparently decided by Manning, page 436. A hypercritic might note other points; but it is fortunate that the editors allowed a wide freedom in matters of opinion, especially as to the character and influence of individuals.[1]

Princeton University. DANA C. MUNRO.

BOOKS OF MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Italian Reformers, 1534–1564. By FREDERIC C. CHURCH. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1932. Pp. xii, 428. $5.00.)

THE period covered by Professor Church's book is the second generation of the sixteenth century, the thirty years lying between the accession of Pope Paul III. and the issuance of the bull *Benedictus Deus* confirming the proceedings of the Council of Trent, a time when society was deeply involved in religious discussion. The purpose of the book is to tell us of the Italian religious reformers who were active in those three decades.

Among the types of men who differed from religious orthodoxy in the Italian peninsula were mystics and rationalists. Mysticism became very influential in Italian life in the twelfth century in the person of Joachim of

[1] This review was prepared for printing by Professor Gray C. Boyce from materials found among the papers of Professor Munro.

Flora and, still more so, in the following century in that of Francis of Assisi. In the period dealt with by this book it was greatly stimulated and refined by the personality and teaching of Juan Valdés, a Spaniard of noble family, about whom gathered a remarkable group of followers in Naples. Rationalists had become increasingly numerous in the peninsula since the days of Frederick II. Among the more notable of later times were Lorenzo Valla, Luigi Pulci, and Pietro Pomponazzi. And of those considered by our author the more important are Matteo Gribaldi and Lelio Sozzini.

Mystic and rationalist alike depended upon neither priest nor book. The inner light of the one and the reliance upon reason of the other left them free to discard all external authority; and all of them were deeply ingrained with the highly individualistic humanism of their time and their country. So they were far bolder in their religious thought than either Luther or Calvin. They had nothing to gain by going over to any of the new churches north and west of the Alps. Fugitives from their native peninsula, many of them led precarious lives, found safety only in silence or in the far-away lands of the Slavic border; while several of them, at home and abroad, suffered for their heresies the penalty of a fiery death.

It is then, so it would seem, with the thought of these men that we should be most concerned. But this book, admirable as is its scholarship, deals only slightly and unsatisfactorily with their religious persuasions and opinions, and is devoted chiefly to their comings and goings, to the external and incidental things of their lives, to the political conditions by which they were surrounded. Such an abundance of biographical detail and political history would be justified were all of it necessary as the background of the thought and the religious activity of the reformers; but much of it is dispensable and has served only to usurp pages that might have been devoted to the intellectual and spiritual contributions of the reformers to the life of their time, to their religious thought and its social implications. Rare are the passages taken from the writings of these heretics; and the few given us are only brief phrases and sentences.

Several of the author's brief statements regarding the thought of these men leave something to be desired. A dozen times we are told that one or another of them believed in "justification by faith". But that phrase differentiates the teaching of nobody from that of the Catholic Church. Surely what is meant is justification by faith *alone*. Why discard the most essential word of the doctrine, the word in which resides the point of cleavage between the two major divisions of Western Christendom? To do so is, however unintentionally, to obscure the truth.

Perhaps we may hope that some day our author will give us another book, one devoted to the large and liberal theme of the teaching of these spiritual explorers, that shall do justice to their profound human purpose,

that shall reveal how close some of them were to the modern world, and shall speak a sympathetic word of the suffering and tragedy of their lives.

Stanford University. EDWARD M. HULME.

Die Reichskirche vom Trienter Konzil bis zur Auflösung des Reiches: Darstellungen und Quellen zu ihrer inneren Geschichte. Herausgegeben von MARTIN SPAHN unter Mitwirkung von ALBERT BRACKMANN und GEORG SCHREIBER. Band I., *Das Erzbistum Trier und die Luxemburger Kirchenpolitik von Philipp II. bis Joseph II.* Dargestellt und durch Aktenstücke erläutert von LEO JUST, Mitarbeiter am Preuss. Historischen Institut in Rom. (Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann. 1931. Pp. xxviii, 453. 57 M.)

THE most neglected period of Church history is, assuredly, the relatively quiet age that intervenes between the storms of the Reformation and the cataclysm of the French Revolution. We may, therefore, welcome the beginning, under Catholic auspices, of a series of studies and source-publications bearing upon the fortunes during that period of the Church of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation.

The author and editor of the first volume has chosen his subject for a special reason. He aims to pave the way for a biography of "Febronius", John Nicholas von Hontheim, auxiliary bishop of Treves, who by a famous book published under that pseudonym in 1763, launched a movement which convulsed Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands during the next quarter of a century, a movement whose professed aim was to vindicate the liberty of the Catholic episcopate against Rome, but whose real tendency was to break up the Church into national units, each one under the domination of the civil power. In order to explain how "Febronius" arrived at this system, Dr. Just has found it necessary to study the development of church-and-state relations in that archdiocese of Treves where Hontheim had worked for thirty years before his book appeared. And since the ecclesiastical province of Treves embraced three politically quite distinct parts—one part which remained German, one which had passed to France or to Lorraine, and one (the duchy of Luxemburg) which belonged successively to the Burgundian, the Spanish, and the Austrian Netherlands—the subject is to be treated apparently in three volumes, one for each part of the archdiocese.

The present volume offers 188 pages of text, reviewing the history of the relations between the see of Treves and the civil rulers in Luxemburg from the later Middle Ages down to the French Revolution. There follow 245 pages of well chosen and carefully edited documents from the archives of Treves, Coblenz, Luxemburg, Brussels, and Vienna.

The main and very real interest of the book lies in its detailed study, in this Luxemburg microcosm, of a conflict which went on throughout the

Catholic world at that time: the conflict between the Church, ever extremely solicitous to preserve its independence but forced by the Protestant revolt and the growing religious indifference of the upper classes to seek protection and support from the state; and state governments which, even under the most ardently Catholic rulers, seemed driven on by some internal necessity to ever increasing nationalism, centralization, and bureaucratic omnipotence. For three centuries the policy of the state towards the Church proceeds in a faultlessly straight line, a line of constant encroachments. This interference at the outset may have been largely dictated by the honest desire to strengthen the Church by helping to correct abuses; but it led, by the seventeenth century, to the claim by the state of a *jus inspectionis* over the Church, and, by the eighteenth century, to a universal and exasperating supervision by state officials now largely indifferent or even hostile to religion. It may be admitted that the Church too long attempted to defend some medieval positions now become untenable: the financial and judicial exemptions of the clergy, the right of asylum, the large number of holy days, etc. But what would seem to be indefensible, according to modern notions of liberty, was the attempt of the state to maintain a veto upon all appointments to benefices; to regulate the education, the discipline, the morals of the clergy; to deny to the Church the right to acquire property or to found new religious communities; to interfere with such purely religious matters as the liturgical books to be used, the prayers to be said, or even—at times—the doctrines to be taught in the churches. Though yielding a good deal of ground, the Church never ceased resisting. The result was constant tension, frequent long drawn out quarrels, and great detriment to religion and the public peace.

From this unhappy situation a tired fighter like "Febronius" saw only one means of escape: the complete surrender of the Church to the state. A later age has usually preferred a different solution: namely, that the Church should renounce the protection or support of the state, but in exchange should gain full independence.

R. H. L.

Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Von Ludwig Freiherrn von Pastor. *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter des Fürstlichen Absolutismus.* Bände XV., XVI., 1, 2, *Von der Wahl Klemens' XI. bis zum Tode Klemens' XIV., 1700–1774.* (Freiburg im Breisgau, and St. Louis: Herder and Company. 1930, 1931, 1932. Pp. xxxvi, 819; xxi, 1011; x, 440. $7.00, $7.50, $3.75.)

Still the great history of the popes awaits completion. When, in the autumn of 1930, its fifteenth volume appeared, a reviewer seemed warranted in expecting soon the final sixteenth and in delaying his verdict on these

closing volumes till he could speak of the vast work as a whole. But the fall of 1931 brought only a "first section" of volume XVI. and the fall of 1932 only a "second section", leaving still untold the story of a quarter-century. The final section can hardly be hoped before another fall, and of what has come there is much to be said.

Even to their latest historian, indeed, the four popes whose careers fill his volume XV. leave a record of futility or of tragedy. Not for lack of personal virtues. To Cardinal Albani, scholar, statesman, administrator, accomplished writer, who as Clement XI. mounted in 1700 the papal throne at the age (early for a pope) of fifty-one and filled it for more than twenty years, Pastor ascribes every ability but that of bold decision. But this lack made him, in the wars of absolutism then shaking Europe, the mere shuttlecock of rival princes, and to the end his papal crown was "a crown of thorns". His successor, Innocent XIII., of that old Roman family which five centuries earlier had furnished in Innocent III. the mightiest of popes, was aged and sickly and lasted but three years. Next came a Dominican friar, Benedict XIII., whose ascetic saintliness made him throughout his half-dozen papal years the helpless victim of a favorite, Coscia, clever but corrupt, whom he made a cardinal, but who resorted "for the satisfying of his insatiable greed" to forgery, extortion, sale of offices. Of better hope seemed the Florentine, Clement XII., who, though nearly eighty and half blind at his accession, lasted from 1730 to 1740. But he soon lost his sight and was a prey to gout and hernia and growing weakness; and, though his easy-going reign was free from glaring scandals, it is only his free-handed patronage of art and letters that to his historian offsets the dwindling vigor of the papal power. Cleverly though Pastor explains the choice of these successive ciphers, it is hard for an outsider to quiet the old suspicion that the secular powers, whose prelate-spokesmen took now the leading part in every conclave, knew how thus to fend off a Pope Stork by conniving at the choice of a Pope Log.

But the scholar and statesman who in 1740 became Pope Benedict XIV. was neither stork nor log. Perhaps the wirepullers thought the bookworm harmless. Perhaps the six-months' conclave, longest since the Middle Ages, wore them out. Perhaps even they were won by the new pope's charm. Certainly that charm has vanquished his historian. "Taken all in all", he says, "Benedict XIV. was the incarnation of the Italian spirit at its best and most lovable." Open-hearted, upright, direct, he looked the man he was. "Of middle height, slightly corpulent, his full, fresh face under his chestnut-brown but graying hair breathed goodness and good will; from his great blue, lively eyes beamed shrewdness and spirit; about his mouth lay a trace of humor." Work was to him second nature; his pen he called his best friend. Till his death, at eighty-four, he needed no glasses. Temperate, even abstinent, simple of diet, up at five and busy till late evening, his duties were a joy. For exercise, of which he craved much, he took long walks—

through the streets of Rome or into the countryside about his Alban villa—chatting freely with those he met.

Even as pope he found time to be a scholar, and a scholar sincere and frank. Muratori, then foremost of Italian men of learning, rejoiced at his accession and was emboldened to ask for Catholic scholarship the fullest freedom. Even of the popes one must write without glozing. Of books, of authors, of miracles, of legends, sound criticism must be welcomed. "Better", he said, "to tell the truth ourselves than to hear it from taunting adversaries." "Holy Church has, thank God, no need of lies; she does not fear the truth." "God be praised for giving us a Pope who is filled with these sentiments." That such a pope moderated the censorship was less startling than that he could correspond with Voltaire himself; and at this even Pastor winces a little. But such *bonhomie* disarmed the hostility of that carping age, and with such a pope a Frederick of Prussia could negotiate. Even a Horace Walpole indited verses in his honor, and a Whig like Macaulay has called him the best and wisest of the popes.

But the hostility which Pope Benedict thus warded off from the Church and its head, flamed all the more hotly against the religious order which made itself the spokesman of reaction; and it is the struggle for the suppression of the Jesuits, unavailing under Clement XIII. (1758–1769), successful under Clement XIV. (1769–1774), that fills nearly all of Pastor's pages on these two popes. Victorious over Jansenism, enriched by the grateful gifts of the devout, and now almost sole masters of the schools, the Jesuits had made foes, too, within the Church. Pope Benedict had ruled against their Chinese and their Malabar rites and seemed to leave them in Portugal at the mercy of their foes. Under Clement XIII., despite that pontiff's loyalty, they were driven from Portugal, from France, from Spain, from much of Italy. "His eleven-year pontificate", says Pastor, "was an unbroken chain of sufferings and oppressions for the Church and of deep humiliations for the Holy See." "His worthiest purposes the princes met with stubborn resistance or with cold rejection, scarcely deigning to answer his letters or doing so with caustic bitterness." Even Catholic lands saw papal briefs burned by the hangman.

The powers saw to it that the next pope was of their choosing; and that pope, the Franciscan Ganganelli—Clement XIV.—has remained a touchstone for the papal historian. As to no other have pens gone so asunder. As to none is it so natural to distrust the Jesuit heirs of Pastor's task. But they assure us (or the publisher does), in a note sent out with this volume, that these pages "in their outline (*der Konzeption nach*) and in their really decisive portions are wholly from the author's pen". Such as we have them they neither adore nor detest; but to their narrative the pope was a helpless tool of secular politics. "The basis of his character", we are told, "was timidity."

He paltered, but he did at last the will of the powers—wearing out his life perhaps in indecision and remorse. That he was poisoned by the Jesuits is scouted as a baseless fable.

Cornell University. GEORGE L. BURR.

Bohemia in the Eighteenth Century: a Study in Political, Economic, and Social History with Special Reference to the Reign of Leopold II., 1790–1792. By ROBERT JOSEPH KERNER, Professor of Modern European History, University of California. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xii, 412. $4.00.)

THIS is the first comprehensive and thoroughgoing monograph on the eighteenth century period of the Bohemian part of the Austrian empire, based mostly on original researches in the archives of Prague and Vienna. As some of the material on which the study was written has since been destroyed in the street riots of Vienna, the work of Professor Kerner has received special value. The main source of the volume is the *Desideria* of the estates, which played a rôle in Austria analogous to that of the French *cahiers*. The history of the eighteenth century is decidedly of capital importance, because this was the time when under the pressure of the French Revolution, the Hapsburg Monarchy did not dare to continue its radical fight against feudalism and made a compromise with it to the detriment of the peasant, thus making the industrialization and centralization of the empire an impossibility. At the same time, the feudal forces could not create real national unity because narrow-minded class interests overshadowed their antiquated form of nationalism and made the growth of real nationalism, based on a free peasantry and a flourishing urban life, very difficult. This conflict of forces, modern and medieval, centralizing and decentralizing, Germanizing and supporting the native Czech language, imperialistic and particularistic, is ably shown by Professor Kerner in all the fields of social, economic, and political life. His work therefore will be an indispensable counterpart to the inquiries in which Professor Marczali has described the corresponding period of Hungarian development. The comparison of the two pictures is very instructive, not only from the strictly historical point of view but also from that of understanding present day political development. That the Czechoslovaks were able to establish a strong and democratic republic, whereas Hungary is still under a veiled feudal dictatorship, is intimately connected with the fact vigorously stressed by Professor Kerner that the greatest part of genuine Czech feudalism was exterminated with the Battle of White Mountain (1620), and that therefore the peasantry became far more self-reliant and prosperous ("The Bohemian peasant was a lord in comparison to the average Polish or Hungarian peasant"), whereas in Hungary the rule of the feudal nobility remained unshaken. The new

feudalism created in Bohemia by the Hapsburgs, though sufficiently strong to impede the work of unification, remained practically rootless in the country; and therefore it lost all importance in the post-war republic, whereas in Hungary the exuberant growth of feudalism remained an obstacle for a self-conscious peasantry and an organized bourgeois class. Also, by a comparison of the economic, cultural, and religious structure of the two countries, very instructive parallels may be drawn on the basis of the abundant and significant material collected with an astounding diligence by Professor Kerner. As the Hungarian and the Bohemian history of the eighteenth century hold the main key to the understanding of the Hapsburg drama, we can safely say that Professor Kerner has made a great contribution to the reconstruction of the main centrifugal forces of the former monarchy.

Oberlin College. OSCAR JÁSZI.

La Grande Peur de 1789. Par GEORGES LEFEBVRE, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1932. Pp. 272. 30 fr.)

THE "great fear" that swept over France at the end of July, 1789, has long puzzled historians. What caused it? Where did it originate? In his *avant-propos* Professor Lefebvre explains the present status of the problem and his own contributions toward its solution. Taine, he points out, who had a sense of social history, understood some of the conditions that caused the popular revolts but neglected to apply his knowledge to an explanation of the "great fear". Other historians have studied the phenomenon in restricted areas—M. Conard in Dauphiné, Miss Pickford in Touraine and Provence, M. Chaudron in Champagne, and M. Dubreuil at Evreux—but they have described only what happened. The need for a comprehensive study of the movement Professor Lefebvre attempts to fill, although he recognizes that, in view of the paucity of regional studies and the dispersion of the documentary evidence, the time has not yet come for a definitive pronouncement. He can only hope to suggest possible solutions and orient further research.

His initial chapters are devoted to an exposition of causes. These he finds, fundamentally, in the deplorable conditions of life prevalent among the lower classes. Famine and unemployment were the perennial bogeys whose frightfulness was increased by the commercial treaty with England in 1786, by the removal of the restrictions on the grain trade in 1787, and by the failure of the harvest in 1788. In the train of famine and industrial depression came mendicity and vagabondage on an unprecedented scale. By March and April, 1789, a sporadic *jacquerie* was already in progress from one end of the kingdom to the other. There was a moment of calm when the states general met, but toward the middle of July the rumor spread that a "complot

aristocratique" had been formed for the destruction of the third estate and that brigands in the employ of the aristocrats were coming to lay waste the countryside. Thence arose the "great fear", which is to be distinguished from earlier and later disturbances by the fact that it was a genuine panic, widely and rapidly propagated.

With a wealth of detailed information before him, accumulated over a period of more than a dozen years of research, Professor Lefebvre is able to trace the currents of "fear" back to their original sources and to plot them on a map with appropriate arrows. Contrary to what one would naturally expect, the panic did not radiate from Paris along the great highways, but originated almost simultaneously in half a dozen provincial localities and spread from village to village by the shortest cuts. The phenomenon first appeared at Nantes on July 20 and spread southeast. Almost at the same hour it appeared at La Ferté in Maine and spread far to the north, west, and south. Other points of origin were: in the region of Chalon-sur-Saône, thence down the valley of the Rhone, spreading east and west; at Estrées-Saint-Denis, north of Paris; at Romilly in Champagne; at Ruffec, north of Bordeaux, spreading thence over southern France as far as the Pyrenees. Certain regions, like Brittany and lower Normandy, were unaffected; and Paris, too, curiously enough, was unaffected, until waves of the panic came rolling in upon the suburbs from Estrées and Romilly.

The reader rises from a perusal of this book with a better comprehension of the French Revolution. The federations of national guards, the *levée en masse,* the familiar catchwords of "vaincre ou mourir", all have their genesis here. It is regrettable that the conditions imposed by the publisher precluded the possibility of footnotes or a detailed bibliography, but Professor Lefebvre promises to publish some day a critical edition of the documents that he has collected.

The University of North Carolina. MITCHELL B. GARRETT.

Stein: eine Politische Biographie. By GERHARD RITTER. Zwei Bände. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 1931. Pp. xi, 542; 408. 26 M.)

THE centennial of the death of Baron vom Stein, the Prussian reformer, added to the interest in him and his period. This interest had been stimulated by the parallel between the years after the Prussian defeat at Jena and the present post-war period. The Germans gave proof a century ago, when Stein promoted the publication of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica,* that more than any other people they consciously turn to their own history for inspiration and the springs of national rejuvenation. For good or evil the historian is a power in every land and in none is he a greater force than in Germany. To-day he shows how in the past the dead bones of the valley of Cheber were brought together and inspired with new life or he pieces to-

gether telegraphic dispatches to exorcise the war guilt myth and force the rewriting of the Treaty of Versailles by appeals to archives. To German readers a new life of Stein is not just another book. It may be hard reading for us but to a thoughtful German in these days it is a speaking, living voice whose message he will carry from the study to the street.

This is not written to say that Professor Ritter's two volumes, compact with facts and closely reasoned interpretation, have any purpose but those proper to a new study of Stein in a centennial year. Thirty years after Lehmann's much criticized three volume biography there was a need for a new study of the sources and the recent literature.

The fine, uncontroversial attitude of the author and his appreciation of his debt to Lehmann whose sources he has restudied with admirable independence and with substantial gains and new interpretations, the incorporation of all the material that has accumulated in a quarter of a century fully justify a task which promised little when undertaken. Yet those rewards of a scholar are not all that have kept the author to his task. "How could one, though simply a German historian, labor on the age of Stein without being constantly aware that the political problems of those times are still the problems of our day."

The first evident novelty is the shift in space and emphasis distinctly to the period of Stein's life preceding 1807, the year in which he entered on his second and great ministry which gave him his place in history. Nearly two-fifths of the whole work, including the notes, are given to ancestry, home, youth, university life, friends and associates, and his official life and labors as a Prussian official in Westphalia. The result is a more thorough examination than any previous biographer has given to the formative influence of the home and of his Göttingen teachers and associates, especially Rehberg. This section contains an independent contribution to the proper appraisal of Rehberg as a very important German political thinker at the close of the eighteenth century. No other had so great an influence on Stein as his college friend whose later career in Hanover paralleled his own in Westphalia (vol. I., pp. 39, 147). This primacy could be disputed on behalf of Heintz, Stein's superior in the early days and a model of all that a provincial administrator should be.

The bitter controversy between Lehmann and Ernst von Meier over the extent to which Stein and his later reforms were influenced by French Revolutionary thought and precedents finds but faint echo in Ritter's well-balanced and well-reasoned text. Instead of the one-sided view into which the controversialists of that day drove each other, Ritter gives due weight to the fact that Stein lived his formative years in the eighteenth century in which France had no monopoly on reform ideas or efforts. And yet no German of intelligence could shut his mind to the works of Montesquieu and the efforts of Turgot, nor be unimpressed by Brandes, Burke, Rehberg, and Justus

Möser. Stein was intelligent and exceptionally widely read. He traveled wherever he might learn the best things about his tasks in France and England. That the later excesses of the Revolution and the oppression of Napoleon earned his undying hatred should not obscure the possibility of his having thought about needed reforms in Prussia in terms that were both German and French, that is, were common in the century of enlightenment. Nor does the author ever forget that Stein was Stein and from his home, his class consciousness as an Imperial Knight, his associates like Heinitz, Brandes, and Rehberg, his experience in Westphalia, and his own ethical and moral concepts he brought to his work something that made him no pale reflection of any other man's thought.

The one gap in these earlier years, the visit to England, Ritter with all his research has not filled but he has made a shrewder guess about it than any previous biographer. The reviewer owes Professor Ritter and all those who have written on Stein recently a humble apology for not having published private archival material on this lost year, material that quite unexpectedly came into his hands after the appearance of his biography of Stein.

The author gives less than one-third of his space to the reform ministry and its measures and even less, properly, to the years from 1808 to Stein's death. One suspects that publishers were venturing much on a two volume biography and it was their wise insistence that kept the author from expanding on all his differences with Lehmann and for that we are grateful. There is enough of it in the notes.

In the approach to the reforms the author preserves the catholic judgment for which he has laid the groundwork in his study of Stein before 1807 and underlines especially the dangers of attributing to imitation what is the outcome of practical necessity. His analysis of Stein's official memoranda and reports while a provincial official and especially of the Nassau memoir is one of the most illuminating contributions that he makes to the understanding of the reform measures, especially the city ordinance of 1808. He brings out more precisely what had been done toward reform before Stein came to power and what part the Königsberg group, disciples of Adam Smith, had in shaping his agrarian and municipal decrees. He attempts no such rounded picture of the old Prussia as Lehmann drew and the needed corrections to that picture which he makes are not grouped and organized so that the reader gets the full force of the new scholarship since Lehmann and Knapp. That it is fully utilized is one of the merits of Professor Ritter's volumes. Of recent writers on economic and social conditions he is most indebted to Robert Stein's work on East Prussia and Ziekursch's on Silesia. His emphasis on the social value and integrity of the East Elbe Junkers in a chapter on the necessity of reform to which they were an insuperable obstacle until after Jena, seems like leaning over backwards in an effort to be historically just. With more justice he characterizes the *Spiessertum* and indifference to reform of

the city bourgeoisie. Frederick William III., a mediocre pedant fitted eminently for a bureaucratic post, or regimental garrison in his own kingdom, conscious of only one large thing, that he was Hohenzollern, is properly loaded with all the responsibility he shunned. The result, among others, is to rescue the able Beyme, and even his less able and less upright fellow secretaries from blame for everything before 1806. They were weak and futile and useful to Frederick William III. because in the presence of such nonentities he felt like a king. Ritter's characterization of the Epigonians of 1806 is in words that are a terrific indictment drawn equally, one suspects, against another Hohenzollern and his advisers in another national crisis.

Professor Ritter's admirable and scholarly work has proved that there was a place for another full length study of Stein and his era. It will not be easy reading for those unfamiliar with the social, political, and administrative institutions of unreformed Prussia, but it is worth the effort if one would know the best interpretation of Stein from the standpoint of recent, post-war German scholarship. It is by far the most significant study that has appeared in the centennial year.

The University of Minnesota. GUY STANTON FORD.

Geschichte der Deutschen Revolution von 1848–1849. VON VEIT VALENTIN. Two volumes. (Berlin: Verlag Ullstein. 1930; 1931. Pp. xv, 662; xi, 770. 18; 21 M.)

AFTER twenty years of study of the first German revolution, the national movement of 1848–1849, Dr. Valentin has produced the most authoritative work upon this important subject. In 1919 his earlier researches were published under the title, *Die Erste Deutsche Nationalversammlung*. Subsequently he continued his studies in the Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Berlin, the Archiv des Bundestages und der Nationalversammlung, Frankfurt, as well as in the archives of Vienna, Stuttgart, Munich, Darmstadt, Karlsruhe, Dresden, and the Central Archive of Moscow. His invaluable bibliography of printed materials since 1850, arranged according to a novel plan of alphabetical subject headings, is conclusive evidence of a thorough knowledge of the vast and conflicting literature concerning this revolution.

The first volume begins with a comprehensive preliminary history of the revolutionary movement, then traces its development to the end of the April revolution and the opening of the Frankfurt parliament. The narrative is indicated by the titles of the following seven chapters: the Austrian Empire, the Prussian Power, Bavaria, the Minor States, Germany, the March Revolution, and the April Revolution. The fifth chapter is a masterly portrayal of a politically divided Germany which is however united in language, literature, art, commerce, industry, and national spirit. The great influence of Treitschke is clearly seen in this treatment of cultural factors. On the other

hand the last two chapters could not have been written until the revolution of 1918–1919 enabled the present generation with the aid of solid historical documents, to restate its position toward nineteenth century revolutionary thought and particularly toward this great epoch of German national life. We are conducted in these seven chapters through the labyrinth of preparations for the revolution and then shown the first dramatic outbreak and apparent victory of the revolutionists. Throughout the entire volume we see the notable results of the author's research but also his constant effort to show the relation of the present to the movements of 1848.

The second volume is divided into nine large parts: the beginnings of the Frankfurt parliament, the German powers and the regency of the Reich, the September crisis, the counter-revolution in Austria, the Prussian *coup d'état,* the work of the Frankfurt parliament, the saving of particularism, civil war over the constitution, and "end, result, and progress". Here the author presents the constitutional work of the revolutionists, the social revolutionary and nationalistic threats to the revolution, the beginning of the counter-revolution and its eventual victory over the uprising of 1849. The final synthesis is stated in the sentence: "The German revolution of 1848–1849 stands between Freiherr vom Stein and Otto von Bismarck." Bismarck's work of unification ends the popular movement with its free national state constitution.

Extensive citations are placed at the end of each volume. References to considerable archive material might well be more precise. The author could improve the organization of his bibliography by the judicious use of cross references, and thus increase its usefulness as a guide to the chronological development of research in this field. Especially valuable for students of historiography is the critical survey of the sources and research work. The chronological tables for the general period as well as the index are to be commended. The author plans to publish in a separate source book the characteristic and rare pamphlets, flysheets, caricatures, and pictures of the revolution together with explanatory notes and a list of all private collections.

The President of the United States was the only head of a foreign government to send greetings to the first German national assembly, while American scholars early agreed that "in proportion as these extraordinary events appeared to have their origin in those great ideas of responsible and popular government on which the American constitutions are wholly founded, they could not but command the warm sympathy of the people of this country". Even during the Bismarckian era American historians appreciated and supported the viewpoint of the Frankfurt democracy. The greatness of Valentin's work lies in the establishment of this interpretation in Germany.

An English translation of this definitive work should be published in the near future. It would not be an easy undertaking. The author's German now and then defies Grimm, Flügel, and Sanders, but illustrates changes in vocabulary of a cultural nature in the revolutionary pamphleteering.

Dr. Valentin has constructed a new, clear, and readable synthesis for this decisive period of nineteenth century European history. Scholars may question his estimates of Metternich, Friedrich Wilhelm IV., and other leading personalities. The majority will however agree with his conclusion that the immortal patriotism of the Reich of 1848, in its purity and earnestness, is the future ally of the German nation.

Stanford University. RALPH HASWELL LUTZ.

The Letters of Queen Victoria. Third Series. *A Selection from Her Majesty's Correspondence and Journal between the Years 1886 and 1901.* Published by Authority of His Majesty the King. Edited by GEORGE EARLE BUCKLE. Volume III., 1896–1901. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1932. Pp. xiv, 662. $9.00.)

"YOUR MAJESTY does not much admire Queen Elizabeth", wrote Rosebery, in March, 1900, just after Victoria had been frantically cheered from St. James's Park to Edgeware Road, "but the visit to London was in the Elizabethan spirit. There was, however, this difference, that with the pride that England felt in Elizabeth there was but little love. Now the nation glows with both." Only two days before, Sir Francis Knollys had declared a telegram of the queen's rejecting any suggestion of outside intervention in the South African war, to be "worthy of Queen Elizabeth". One can find real justification for the comparison. It is not merely that Victoria, in her eighty-first and last year, half crippled and half blind, was leading her subjects vigorously and courageously through some of the blackest months of all her reign; that she was outstripping her advisers in demands for a more energetic prosecution of the war, and setting an example to her subjects in fortitude and optimism. More remarkable is the fact that the aloof and quite German little lady who appeared in the earlier volumes of the *Letters,* had come to seem as English as Elizabeth, and as able as Elizabeth had been, during Armada days, to reach her subjects' hearts. Victoria's chair or little chaise rolled up and down incessantly, not only before ranks of soldiers waiting to go overseas, but between tables spread for the women and children whom they left behind. It was no longer the welfare of the aristocracy, but that of the poorest of her subjects which principally concerned her now. She was troubled by the thought that the working classes would be forced to share the expenses of the war through taxes such as that on beer. Indeed her sympathies had the widest scope. She visited Ireland at much personal cost, in order to foster a better spirit there; and she reached the point of indiscretion in expressing her interest and indignation concerning that "poor martyr", Dreyfus. But if she seemed more kindly and more generous, she had never, in some respects, been mightier. That Salisbury considered her influence over the Kaiser "a powerful defence against danger" will surprise no one:

but it is a very striking fact that the leading British periodicals, not even excepting *Punch,* should, at her privately expressed desire, have taken a milder tone regarding Germany.

So, Victoria's figure, silhouetted sharply against the revealing light cast by the war in South Africa, passes triumphantly and graciously from the stage: and so the richest and most enticing series of personal documents that can ever be offered to students of nineteenth century British history reaches its close. As was to be expected, the high standard of editing is maintained. Whether Mr. Buckle has made the best possible selection from the papers placed at his disposal is, of course, a matter of taste and still more of surmise. Students of pre-war European diplomacy, their appetites whetted by his spicy offerings, may wonder whether he could not have gratified them still more. But they, as well as students of English history, of late nineteenth century civilization, and even of the human comedy generally, will lay down the volume with a sigh at the thought that it is the last. They will hope, too, that the editor may find another task worthy of his powers.

Wesleyan University. HERBERT C. BELL.

Rural Russia under the Old Régime: a History of the Landlord-Peasant World and a Prologue to the Peasant Revolution of 1917. By GEROID TANQUARY ROBINSON. (New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 1932. Pp. x, 342. $4.00.)

PROFESSOR ROBINSON'S volume may be greeted as one of the rare books on Russia, published in America, which is based on a thorough study of literature and documents in the Russian language. Most of the recent works published here suffer from lack of historical background and Robinson's book will fill this gap, at least as regards the history of the agrarian problem in Russia. The author plans to publish another volume (or volumes) on peasants in the recent revolution, but the present work may be of even greater importance for an American reader, since it introduces him to the pre-revolutionary development of this agrarian problem.

The first four cnapters give the history of the origin and the evolution of serfdom in Russia before emancipation (1861). In this part, the writer follows the best Russian historians, such as Kliuchevsky, Platonov, Diakonov, Semevsky, Beliaev, and others. He describes how serfdom in the process of evolution finally triumphed in the eighteenth century just at the time when the nobles were "emancipated" from their obligations to the state. He explains also why, during the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries, the cultural gap between the peasantry and the landlords widened more and more.

In the next four chapters the author analyzes the emancipation of the peasant-serfs (1861) and the conditions in which the peasantry and the land-

lords were placed between 1861 and 1905. He presents quite clearly the limitations of the act of the emancipation, showing that the reform "did not effect a revolutionary change in the internal organization of the peasantry", and, what is more important, that "with the abolition of immediate personal subjection to the landlord, there was transferred to the peasant commune the bulk of the public law which the masters had formerly exercised upon their serfs". The heavy burden upon the peasantry of the redemption payments for the land which they obtained at the time of liberation is also emphasized, as well as the diminished area of peasant's holdings in comparison with what they held while serfs, particularly in the belt of the black soil. In his examination of the economic conditions of the peasantry and its evolution during these years the author seems to prefer a historical analysis of judicial acts to a thorough study of economic facts illustrated by statistical data. Such data, particularly since 1880, are abundant. Even those data which the writer includes in his study are presented in a form which would not satisfy an economist who is a statistician. Perhaps for that reason, the conclusions of the author in this field are not quite definite. He does not risk saying that the economic situation of the peasantry either improved or became worse during the fifty years after emancipation.

Mr. Robinson describes the revolution of 1905 in chapters IX. and X., and includes many other than its agrarian aspects, such as the policies of the political parties and of the government, and the causes of failure. He focusses attention, however, upon the agrarian movement, and his conclusion is that this movement was caused mostly by the economic condition of the peasantry rather than by the propaganda of the revolutionary parties. The revolutionary parties followed the spontaneous movement of the peasants rather than led it.

The two final chapters are concerned with an analysis of the agrarian policy of the government and of the conservative Russian groups during the decade between the first and the second revolutions (1905 and 1917) and of the economic condition of the peasantry and the landlords on the eve of the revolution of 1917. The author says that "this intervening decade was a period of change so rapid and so profound as in itself to constitute a kind of revolution". He recognizes that during this period the ties by which the peasants had been bound to their households and their commune before the revolution of 1905 "were greatly weakened, sometimes dissolved entirely, in favor of a far more individualistic order". The analysis of the principles of the so-called Stolypin agrarian reform and its great importance are well set forth. The author says that "it seems possible that there had been some improvement in the material condition of the majority of the peasants". He states also that during the last years before the war (1910–1914) there was a marked decline in the local agrarian disturbances, though the industrial strike movement in Russia mounted steadily. He recognizes even that "it is

possible that by reason of the economic and legal developments . . . the likelihood of a general uprising of the peasants against the landlords was diminishing".

The bibliography covers a fairly large list of Russian publications used by the author, but omits many relating to the economic analysis of the pre-revolution agrarian question in Russia.

The work may be commended to American readers as a study impartial in character and founded on a thorough analysis of literature and documents. The author constantly shows his sympathy with the peasant class in its struggle against the landlords and the Russian czarist government, but at the same time he mentions also the efforts of the government, particularly since 1905, to solve the problem.

The University of Michigan. V. P. TIMOSHENKO.

Documents Diplomatiques Français, 1871–1914. Série 2 (1901–1911), tome III., *3 Janvier–4 Octobre, 1903.* Série 3 (1911–1914), tome IV., *1 Octobre–4 Décembre, 1912.* [Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Commission de Publication des Documents relatifs aux Origines de la Guerre de 1914.] (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1931; 1932. Pp. xxviii, 640; xxxviii, 668. 60 fr. each.)

TEN of the admirable volumes of French pre-war diplomatic documents have been published, three in each of the first two series, and four in the third series from 1911 to 1914. As the editors now estimate that there will be altogether some 45 or 50 volumes, and as they appear at the rate of four or five a year, one may hope to see the collection complete in less than a decade.

During the first nine months of the year 1903, the Morocco Question, as so often, dominated French foreign policy. M. Delcassé at Paris and M. Saint-René-Taillandier at Tangier wished to consolidate French influence in the sultan's empire, but without seeming to intervene unnecessarily or to change the status quo, in order not to antagonize the other great powers. Exclusive French loans urged upon the impecunious and spendthrift sultan, with hints at railroad concessions and the employment of French technical advisers in return (pp. 12, 18, 21, 522 f.), energetic protection of the Algerian frontier (p. 386), and the sending of French naval forces equal to those of England into Moroccan waters (pp. 268, 326, 423 ff.), seemed to be the most effective and least alarming methods of securing French interests.

Germany appeared likely to give little trouble. Bülow hoped that the status quo would be maintained, and had spoken of German interests in Morocco as "insignificant up to the present" (p. 31). But the French noted with some uneasiness that German trade in Morocco was growing with alarming rapidity, though the statistics regarding it varied greatly (pp. 56–59, 70). Also the attitude of Mentzingen, the German minister at Tangier, was

much less cordial and intimate than that of his English colleague, Sir Arthur Nicolson (pp. 170 ff.).

Spain and England, however, were insistent on protecting their respective interests in Morocco, and with them France carried on protracted negotiations. Spain, suspecting that Morocco might eventually lose its independence or be divided into protectorate zones, wanted to make sure that she should secure control of a generous slice on the northern coast opposite Spain; France was willing to accept the idea of allotting something, and so amicable relations between the peoples across the Pyrenees were preserved by the firm and friendly tact of M. Jules Cambon, at that time French ambassador at Madrid. The British cabinet also gradually made up their minds to accept French predominance in Morocco in return for a free hand for themselves in Egypt. M. Delcassé, in spite of French public opinion, was quite ready for such a bargain, and so began upon his visit to London in July, 1903, the discussions which ultimately led to the Anglo-French Entente of 1904, the details of which are already familiar from the British documents.

Whether this rapprochement with England was liable to weaken Franco-Russian intimacy and enable Willy's intrigues to seduce Nicky caused some concern to the French (pp. 501f., 520ff., 527f., 546–551). On the whole, the French concluded, there was no serious danger of this. Delcassé was careful to assure St. Petersburg that the Russian alliance still formed the keystone of French policy and persistent fidelity. Count Benckendorff, the newly-arrived Russian ambassador in England, whose portrait and whose timidity in making reports to his government are delightfully pictured by M. Paul Cambon, was flattered by being accorded a long interview with Delcassé in London; this gave Benckendorff the welcome basis for a long report to St. Petersburg, "which was for him like a refreshing draught in the political Sahara" (p. 521). Franco-Russian joint military plans continued to be discussed very intimately and cordially through General Pendezec's visit with the Russian chief-of-staff, General Sakharov (pp. 540–542, 605–614). And Delcassé, together with the French ambassadors in London and St. Petersburg, considered how they might advantageously use their influence to bring about more friendly relations between their Russian ally and their new English friends. This was a great change from the year 1901, when France and Russia were discussing a possible naval convention to supplement their military convention of 1894 and to provide for the coöperation of the French and Russian navies *against England* (pp. 601–605).

There were, however, some rifts in the Franco-Russian lute. One was caused by Count Lamsdorff's touchiness and by the indiscipline of the press in both countries. Lamsdorff, who with Goluchowski of Austria had drawn up a program of reform for Macedonia, felt that "he had acquitted himself conscientiously of the mission which he had conferred on himself" in the matter, and regarded "every initiative other than his own as an inopportune

intervention and a misunderstanding of his own preëminent rôle" (p. 138). Unfortunately the Paris *Matin* intimated (incorrectly) that France also might have proposals for reform, whereupon Lamsdorff complained forcibly to the French ambassador and there was an outburst of Pan-Slav attacks against France in the Russian press. Delcassé in turn felt aggrieved: in France, because of the very liberal press laws, "the newspapers are beyond all control and repression, so that as a consequence the government is not to be held responsible for the violent articles of a few editors. But it is not the same in Russia, where the press is placed under strict surveillance." So he was astonished that "articles giving a most disobliging and false color to French policy seemed to enjoy a quite unaccustomed license on the part of the imperial censor" (p. 232).

The year 1903 was also of decisive importance in two other matters in which French and Russian policies were not in complete harmony. Germany had acquired the concession for the Bagdad Railway, wanted the participation of foreign capital for its construction, and was willing to make arrangements which had the appearance of giving an equal control to each of the proposed participating powers. The British cabinet at first approved participation, but under a storm of English newspaper criticism quickly reversed its attitude (pp. 233–235, 260–265). Russian ministers were at first in disagreement among themselves, but quickly decided against participation. Witte even stated that, far from providing a single ruble for participation, he would consider favorably, if requested, making the sacrifice of funds to *prevent* the construction of the Bagdad Railway (p. 179). Rouvier, the French minister of finance, and the French bankers were strongly in favor of participation, and Delcassé was at first willing, provided that France was accorded absolute equality with Germany in the management (pp. 27, 46, 102–104). But in view of Russia's absolute disapproval and of his own suspicion that France was being accorded equality only in form and not in reality, he eventually turned against the project, and also against a proposal for consolidating the Ottoman debt, which he feared would liberate Turkish funds which might be used for the Bagdad Railway. In a long memoir read to the French cabinet, he successfully combatted the views of Rouvier and the bankers (pp. 450–454, 469–471, 479–480, 487–492).

In 1903, also, Russian action in Manchuria aroused protests in England, the United States, and especially in Japan. France was disturbed, particularly after her rapprochement with England, but was unable to exercise a moderating influence at St. Petersburg, because the czar's autocratic ukase of August 12, appointing Admiral Alexeiev as viceroy in the Far East, had completely eliminated poor Lamsdorff from any control over the situation and had contributed to the dismissal of the pacific Witte. Under these circumstances, ought France to make a new loan to Russia? Here again a

difference arose between the French foreign and finance ministers, because Rouvier approved the Russian loan without consulting Delcassé as to political conditions (pp. 240, 413).

The other volume, covering only nine weeks, but momentous ones (Oct. 1-Dec. 4, 1912), is naturally filled chiefly with the peace efforts of the great powers and their fears, suspicions, and vacillations in the face of the first Balkan War: Sazonov's alarm and eleventh hour effort to back water after having contributed to a very dangerous situation which he could no longer control, and his fear that Pan-Slav excitement might sweep Russia into war as it did in 1877; Berchtold's dismay at a hostile Balkan combination which might extend Serbia to the Adriatic and turn against Austria after defeating Turkey; Grey's hesitancy in putting too much pressure on the sultan for fear of antagonizing the millions of Mohammedans in India; Kiderlen-Waechter's policy of watchful waiting to see how events would turn out; Poincaré's sincere efforts to prevent and then to end a war which threatened French investments as well as peace between the great powers; and at the same time his solicitude not to offend the Balkan states whose alliance he recognized as a great potential asset to the Triple Entente. After long negotiations the great powers finally agreed on a formula urging the Balkan Allies not to attack Turkey, and warning them that, even if they did so, it would profit them nothing, because the great powers would not recognize at the end of the conflict any change in the status quo in the Balkans. The formula was presented to Montenegro at 11 A. M. on October 8. But at 9:30 that same morning Montenegro handed the Turkish ambassador his passports stating that the Montenegrin declaration of war was being delivered at Constantinople. Within three weeks, with the first military successes of the Balkan Allies, the great powers found themselves faced with a *fait accompli* which made them all abandon completely their "non-recognition" policy. It is a precedent which hardly augurs success for President Hoover's similar non-recognition policy in regard to Manchuria.

The conflict over the Austro-Italian desire for the creation of an autonomous Albania and the exclusion of Serbia from the Adriatic; Sazonov's disturbing reticence and vacillation as to his real aims; and the Grey-Cambon exchange of notes tightening the Anglo-French Entente are all indicated in detail, though the main facts have already become familiar through the German and Austrian published documents and the memoirs of Grey and Poincaré. Noteworthy, however, are the reports (indicated in the excellent analytical table of contents) on the fears in Belgium that France and England might not respect her neutrality, and that she must therefore be prepared to protect it herself by reorganizing the Belgian army.

Harvard University. SIDNEY B. FAY.

Mémoires du Maréchal Joffre, 1910–1917. Deux tomes. (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1932. Pp. 491; 465. 36 fr.)

The Personal Memoirs of Joffre, Field Marshal of the French Army. Translated by Colonel T. Bentley Mott, D.S.M. Appendices by Colonel S. J. Lowe, D.S.O., O.B.E. Two volumes. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1932. Pp. viii, 324; vi, 657. $6.00.)

Joffre's *Memoirs* offer a welcome contrast to others which have appeared in recent years. They are neither an off-hand commentary, nor an apologia, nor an impersonal *précis* of office files; and even a first glance makes clear that they are in every sense his own work. Joffre realized clearly what the task implied and was willing to devote to it the time and labor necessary: begun in 1922, the book was finished only in 1928. No space is wasted in discussing familiar events outside Joffre's field of responsibility, but the matters he takes up are discussed without haste or the common failing of crowding for the sake of brevity. The book shows throughout the characteristic traits of order and method, and a singular gift of selecting and stressing the essential point; one result is to brush away completely the post-war caricature which portrayed Joffre as an impassive figurehead carried along by the brains of subordinates at G. Q. G. The text has not been padded out with documents already in print (even those which would have served to bring out his personal rôle most effectively have been sacrificed to this general rule), but a large number of new documents are presented. Among these are papers from a *dossier strictement personnel,* which are often particularly illuminating.

The book is in no way an autobiography. It opens with Joffre's appointment to the *Conseil Supérieur de la Guerre* in 1910, and in the sixth sentence we find him at work. The first section (nearly half of volume I.) deals with the huge task of army reform in the years just before 1914, a field heretofore familiar chiefly as a stage background of post-war controversies. Joffre offers a more factual approach; he brings out for the first time the surprising condition into which the army had fallen, and it is typical of his matter-of-fact attitude that the politician is not made the scapegoat for all the shortcomings of the army and the ministry of war. Plan XVII. first appears in its true light: *i.e.*, a drastic recasting of defective mobilization and railway arrangements which had hitherto condemned the French deployment to a peculiarly helpless defensive. More than one defender of the general staff has denied the charge that the intervention of German reserve divisions was not foreseen by the staff in 1914; Joffre settles this controversy by explaining that exactly this error was made. Very characteristically, instead of avoiding it as a painful topic he takes it up in some detail with the same objective interest as in other matters of happier recollection.

The subject-matter of the war chapters is much too full (and too important) for comment in a brief review. Broadly speaking, they form what may

be termed a contemporary narrative rather than a retrospective historical survey: the author (most fortunately) sets forth in turn the specific problems he had to deal with as they were seen and understood at the time. What results is only a part of the whole panorama, but it is an actual and real part—not an artificial composite put together in the light of later knowledge. The narrative of 1914 is very detailed: the Marne campaign is dealt with day by day. The second volume brings a change of scale and a far wider field. Covering 1915 and 1916, it takes up not only the campaigns in France but also Joffre's part in the conduct of the war on other fronts; the unending difficulties of bringing allies into some common line of action; and the ever increasing pressure of parliamentary opposition in France. The mere record of these simultaneous complications impinging from every quarter fairly makes the head swim: nothing brings home more convincingly to a reader the clarity of mind and solidity of character which made it possible to carry so overwhelming a burden. As yet Joffre is in a sense an unknown figure: his true reputation will arise only gradually, as the vast scale of his task and his achievement comes to be appreciated.

Colonel Mott, an experienced hand, has produced a readable and competent version of a text bristling with difficulties for the translator. The American edition however omits at least one section and relegates others (including four entire chapters from volume I.) to a brief summary printed as an appendix; the student will turn to the original edition.

Cambridge. T. H. Thomas.

Weltkrieg ohne Waffen: die Propaganda der Westmächte gegen Deutschland, ihre Wirkung und ihre Abwehr. Von Hans Thimme, Dr. Phil. und Mitglied des Reichsarchivs. (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger. 1932. Pp. viii, 294. 6.80 M.)

This work is one of the most interesting and scholarly studies of war propaganda which has yet appeared. Like most of its predecessors it traces the development of propaganda both in organization and in method. The slow unification of various agencies in the different countries of the Entente is treated in some detail as well as the ingenuity of the subterranean devices employed to get propaganda material into German hands. The work also includes chapters on the efforts of German emigrants in Switzerland and Holland to overthrow the German monarchy—efforts largely futile because of their suspected, if not actual, affiliation with French interests.

The special significance of the book, however, lies in its emphasis not on the methods but on the successful results of enemy propaganda on the German front. According to Herr Thimme Germany failed to perceive in time the danger of the propaganda or to take adequate measures of defense. The reasons for the success of the Entente powers he finds in the good psychology of their appeal, the use they made of the differences of opinion in Germany

and even more in certain vulnerable aspects of German political philosophy. The opposition of Bavaria to Prussia, the autonomist interests in Alsace-Lorraine, the anti-monarchical and anti-militaristic feeling, the rising tide of democracy, and incipient class warfare were all played up to the utmost. It is to be noted in passing, however, that the Allies were cautious in their attacks on the Kaiser—the direct assault in England did not begin until 1918—and even more cautious in regard to Hindenburg. At the same time the pessimism in German philosophy and its glorification of the state were made much of. "The reverence toward the state was represented in these polemics as idolatry, the high value placed on the individual was pictured as 'primitive clannishness', the teaching of the necessity of evil as a shameless attack on morality." On the other hand, the political philosophy of the Allies or what, for the time being, they supposed their political philosophy to be, with its insistence on democracy, freedom, and self-determination, and its optimistic belief in their duty and their power to spread these ideas abroad in the world, formed a most effective appeal.

To check this propaganda which was being poured out in floods upon the soldiers at the front as well as upon neutrals, the German government sought in vain, trying successively punishment and then reward, but punishment was difficult to enforce and the promise of reward only whetted curiosity and increased the very thing the government was endeavoring to prevent. As for positive propaganda to take its place, "What", asks Herr Thimme, "had Germany really to offer? The natural aim of the war on the part of Germany—to secure a part in world affairs proportionate to her strength—could scarcely be expected to appeal to the sympathy of neutrals." Here then lay the reason for Germany's ultimate failure, not in propaganda alone but propaganda dropped in exceedingly fertile soil and with no effective defense.

For what seems to him the utter breakdown in the Versailles treaty of the alleged ideals of the Entente as well as of some of the falsifications involved in the war propaganda, Herr Thimme has nothing but scorn. But at the same time he recognizes the sincerity of many of the efforts of the Allies and although he leaves the impression that what German propaganda there was, was defensive rather than aggressive, his work on the whole is marked by moderation and detachment.

His statements concerning official efforts on the part of the German government to meet enemy propaganda at the front are supported by evidence in the form of official documents, a number of which he gives in an appendix. Specimens of Allied propaganda by means of cartoons are also included, as for instance, one sent by balloon into Germany in the summer of 1918 which represents the Kaiser marching along in military array between haggard hordes and followed by his six sons. The legend below reads, "A family which has not lost a single member".

Vassar College. ELOISE ELLERY.

Traditions et Politique de la France au Levant. Par ANDRÉ BRUNEAU, Docteur en Droit. Préface de M. CH. GUILHAUMON, Député, Vice-Président de la Commission de l'Armée. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1932. Pp. xii, 445. 45 fr.)

IN this impressive volume M. Bruneau is concerned with what he regards as the perceptible diminution of French influence in the Levant. France once wielded an extensive sway, originating in the traditions of the Crusades and friendship with the Ottoman empire. Recently, what with the downfall of the Ottoman régime, the rise of nationalism, and British imperialism, this dominion has been undermined. The Syrian mandate is the remaining vestige of French influence. Therefore, this author holds, in order that France, in whose hands the execution of Syria's historic mission has been placed, may perform that function in keeping with her traditions and cultural dominance, the present mandatory relation should be replaced by an "act of guarantee". Thus the Third Republic would be in a position "to preside at the new evolution of the Eastern Question", namely, the Question of Asia.

For some years M. Bruneau was in the service of France in the Levant. He writes as a "good" Frenchman, out of full knowledge of a complex situation, and not without some detachment. Unfortunately his volume is not particularly convincing, however valuable it may be as a complete presentation of a fairly moderate view of France's mission in the East.

In the first place the volume lacks balance. The emphasis upon French tradition in the Levant (running to five chapters and nearly 250 pages) seems out of proportion to the few tantalizing pages devoted to the proposed "act of guarantee". None can dispute the origins of French culture in the East, however great may be the disagreement as to its extent and vitality. Yet about the "act of guarantee" there are many things we should like to know. M. Bruneau does little to satisfy our curiosity.

Again, in attacking Britain as a principal cause of the weakening of French influence in the East, emphasis is placed upon a subordinate factor. French influence is probably jeopardized, but so is British, and American, and that of Western civilization generally. And for the same reason: the expansion of Western civilization has been imperialist and the East is in revolt against it.

Finally, M. Bruneau's analysis of "civilizations" and "civilization" in chapter VI., preliminary to his defense of France's "civilizing mission", ignores completely the essential problem of standards. Cultures recommend themselves to their respective adherents for different reasons; the standards of measurement are never the same. Few Frenchmen need to be persuaded that French culture is superior to all others. But the mere assertion of this conviction (and this author's position amounts to little more) is hardly sufficient to enlist the political sympathies of Druses or Bedouins.

In the aggregate these things detract considerably from the value of the book. At the same time, however, its worth probably lies in the very point of view which has just been criticized. For this reason it is well worth the time of all those who have a serious interest in the contact of "civilizations".

Williams College. DONALD C. BLAISDELL.

Pan Chao, Foremost Woman Scholar of China, first century A.D.: Background, Ancestry, Life, and Writings of the Most Celebrated Chinese Woman of Letters. By NANCY LEE SWANN, Ph.D., the Gest Chinese Research Library, McGill University. [Published for the American Historical Association.] (New York: Century Company. 1932. Pp. xix, 179. $6.00.)

THIS is one of two outstanding studies by American sinologists whose works were published by the American Historical Association in 1932. Pan Chao was a woman scholar of *ancient,* not modern China—a slight ambiguity which, however, is rectified on the inner title-page by the addition of the words "first century A. D." We have here for the first time a definitive study of a gifted Chinese woman of antiquity, and at the same time a vivid portrayal of the social and intellectual background of the age in which she lived. There is brought together in concise and well-documented form practically all the known data concerning this historian, poet, teacher, and moralist who came from a family in which the father, Pan Piao, and the two brothers, Pan Ku and Pan Ch'ao, were equally distinguished. The documents at the authors's disposal were not too numerous to be effectively handled. The translations are conscientiously done; the annotations adequate and judiciously supplemented with Chinese characters, and the index is complete. One wonders, however, whether Miss Swann's rendering of *shêng-jên* as "Holy Men" does not convey to Westerners religious overtones which make the more usual rendering "sages" still preferable. It might have been profitable, also, to trace the fortunes of the Pan family, or rather of the Pan cult, down to more recent times—particularly as these have come down to us in the district topography of Fu-fêng (Shensi) which most records agree was the Pan family's ancestral home. A shrine to Pan Chao long stood on the East street of that city, and in 1815 a new one was erected adjoining the temple to the God of Literature (see local gazetteer of 1818, ch. 6). As late as 1619 a reputed descendant of the family, Pan Tzŭ-chiang, and three sons, (also named) are reported to have eked out a precarious existence near the home site (Lan t'ai or Pan-chia-t'ai) southwest of the city. In that year a monument was erected on Fei-fêng-shan, south of the city, stating that funds had been collected to restore to these descendants twenty acres (130 *mu*) of their ancestral lands, "together with a dwelling and seed and oxen (for planting crops) in order that the children might be adequately reared and the [Pan]

family name enlarged" (ch. 8). The tenacity of these local traditions may be imagined from the fact that the tomb of Pan Ku is designated as "beside the post road" six miles (18 *li*) east of Fu-fêng (ch. 7); and that late in the sixteenth century a shrine was erected to Pan Piao and his two sons, on the afore-mentioned Fei-fêng-shan, to which the name of the daughter, Ts'ao Ta-ku, *i.e.*, Pan Chao, was also admitted in 1718 (ch. 6).

The Library of Congress. ARTHUR W. HUMMEL.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States. By CHARLES O. PAULLIN, Carnegie Institution of Washington. Edited by JOHN K. WRIGHT, Librarian, American Geographical Society of New York. (Published jointly by the Carnegie Institution of Washington and the American Geographical Society of New York. 1932. Pp. xv, 162, 166 Plates. $15.00.)

THE *Atlas* is a large folio with sheets approximately eleven by fourteen inches. This format, which is one of its most important features, permits the reproduction of maps on a reasonably large scale in a volume which can be easily handled and which will not cause a complete disarrangement of bookshelves. The editors are to be congratulated on a fine solution for a most difficult problem. The first half of the volume is given up to explanatory material including a statement concerning sources, relating to each of the maps which follow. These textual comments vary from very brief statements to long discussions (in the case of boundary problems) including quotations from documentary material. Between the two parts of the volume is an excellent index.

The first group of maps deals with the natural environment: topography, soil, physiographic divisions, forest cover, and climate. The climatic maps are outstanding. There follows a collection of reproductions of famous or significant old maps under the heading of cartography. Most of these are sufficiently large and clear to make them usable. The selection, which includes the inevitable Behaim globe and the Cosa map, embraces forty-two items and makes a valuable and useful group. Next comes an interesting Indian series, starting with the usual presentation of linguistic areas and tribal locations. This map helps to perpetuate the inappropriate name, Wampanoag, for the Pokanoket group of tribes in eastern Massachusetts. The four maps which mark "Indian battles" from 1521 to 1890 show no "battles" in New Mexico since 1694. Such an omission hardly does justice to the Navajos and the Apaches. The conflicts between those tribes and the whites subsequent to 1694 have been many. It is to be regretted that the editors did not include a map of the Mound Builder culture area showing

sites and another showing the expansion and contraction of the Pueblo culture area. The conventional exclusion of Indian history from American history is becoming increasingly difficult to defend.

Three maps are devoted to exploration, presenting Spanish, French, and American explorations in the West. The latter two show the routes of the explorers in their relations to relief; the first omits relief and as a consequence loses much in value. Such inconsistencies of method occur more than once in the *Atlas*. Very useful and illuminating is the section devoted to "Lands" which contains much information not easily available.

The great contributions of the *Atlas* are the maps presenting the distribution of different religious denominations at various dates, the series dealing with boundary disputes (including both international and state boundaries), the series showing the geographical distribution of votes on a considerable number of important federal enactments, and the section devoted to social legislation and educational progress in the several states. In these sections the *Atlas* is outstanding. They are of the greatest value to the historical scholar and teacher.

The maps relating to economics are grouped into seven subdivisions: manufacturing, transportation, exports and imports by customs districts, agriculture, distribution of wealth by states, banks, and federal income taxes by states. These maps are useful although they contain little not easily available. Following the economic maps is a group of reproductions of old plans of cities, such as the L'Enfant plan for Washington. The usefulness of the collection would be enhanced if it included selected plans for cities proposed by important city planning commissions. It may be argued that such plans represent only ideals which have never been realized. They are, however, an important item in American intellectual history. Their omission from this historical atlas is unfortunate. The military maps which conclude the volume approach the ridiculous. They are scarcely equal to common textbook maps. The *Atlas* gives the same space to the military and naval operations of American forces in the World War as that allotted to the boundary between the United States and Canada in the Bay of Fundy. Military operations are closely adjusted to topography, highways, railroads, and food-producing or industrial areas. In only one map, that of the St. Mihiel offensive, do topography and transportation routes appear. If the editors were not willing to do the military maps in any but a perfunctory way, they would have been well advised to have omitted them completely.

Yale University. RALPH H. GABRIEL.

The Harkness Collection in the Library of Congress: Calendar of Spanish Manuscripts concerning Peru, 1531–1651. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1932. Pp. x, 336. $3.25.)

THIS beautifully presented volume places the student world in possession of the vast array of facts contained in the historical documents which were given to the Library of Congress by the splendid generosity of Mr. Edward S. Harkness in 1929 (through the friendly suggestion of Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach). As Dr. J. F. Jameson justly observes in his preface, the Harkness Collection richly supplements that other precious series of documents which is in the Henry E. Huntington Library at San Marino, California, this being a collection known to students since 1925, when it was admirably calendared by Messrs. Maggs Brothers, of London. In the volume now under review, the Harkness Collection, comprising 1405 folios of manuscript material, has been arranged and its substance set forth with masterly skill by Miss Stella R. Clemence. The volume is, so we are told, the first of a series of three, the others being a volume of transcriptions and translations (also prepared by Miss Clemence), and a calendar of the documents referring to Mexico.

The arrangement of the material is strictly chronological, the earliest document in the calendar being dated at Coaque (Ecuador) on April 19, 1531, and the penultimate document being dated at Guamanga, February 23, 1651. The last document of all is a letter from the Viceroy Marquis of Villagarcía to the Cabildo of Guamanga and dated at Lima, September 16, 1740. The bulk of the collection here calendared is made up of 1004 folios of notarial instruments, and the rest consists of royal cédulas (8 folios), viceregal decrees (166 folios), and two *libros de cabildo* (Chachapoyas and Guamanga) of 227 folios.

A large proportion of the documents in the Harkness Collection bears upon business matters in Colonial Peru—lawsuits, administration of property, slaves, loans and merchandising, and many other affairs. Not only does this afford us many intimate details of colonial life, but often the documents throw light on the doings and whereabouts of important persons at important dates. Particularly valuable are three documents (p. 17) dated at Santiago de Quito on August 26 and 27, 1534, in which Pedro de Alvarado sold to Pizarro and Almagro all his rights as a discoverer and conqueror in the South Sea, and also one *galeon*, three *naos*, and two *navios*. The price to be paid was 100,000 pesos for which Almagro makes himself responsible.

At the end of the volume are two excellent indexes, the one of persons mentioned in the two *libros de cabildo*, the other of all the people mentioned in the *Calendar*. This last constitutes, incidentally, a register of a large number of Spaniards who took part in the conquest and settlement of Peru. By using it wisely, the student will be able to obtain information, through the documents in the *Calendar*, about almost every important Spanish settler in Peru during the sixteenth century and later.

No one can doubt that this sightly volume and the great collection of documents which it describes will permanently and increasingly serve all who study Peruvian colonial history. No library which claims to possess

Latin-Americana and no student of Latin American history can well neglect it. To Mr. Harkness, the generous donor, and to Dr. Jameson and Miss Clemence who have prepared, with patience and skill, the material in the *Calendar*, the student public is deeply indebted.

Paris. PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS.

Dissolution of the Virginia Company: the Failure of a Colonial Experiment. By WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, New York University. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1932. Pp. vi, 350. $3.00.)

IN this study the author has done more than discuss the dissolution of the Virginia Company of London. He devotes two of his ten chapters to an outline of the settlement and early years of the company. Then in five chapters he reviews the reforms introduced by Sir Edwin Sandys between 1618 and 1620, and the business procedure followed by the company in its attempt to build up investment and to stimulate colonization. It is really in the last three chapters that he traces the failure and bankruptcy of the corporation leading to the royal investigation of 1623 and the resultant dissolution.

Mr. Craven has performed a difficult but extremely valuable task. He has not only analyzed the court books (published in volumes I. and II. of the *Records of the Virginia Company of London*), but has painstakingly searched through some eight hundred documents that constitute the records, both official and unofficial, between 1618 and 1624, and that will appear in the forthcoming third and fourth volumes of that work now being issued by the Library of Congress.

Over and over again, and properly, Mr. Craven emphasizes the fact that the company "was primarily a business organization with large sums of capital invested by adventurers whose chief interest lay in the returns expected from their investment". To quote further: "The true *motif* of the company's history is economic rather than political." "The first organization had to be partly in the nature of government, but it was primarily an administrative organization for economic purposes." "In any attempt to judge the record of the Virginia adventurers, it should not be forgotten that they were truly adventurers in a new and uncharted field of commercial speculation with little in the way of previous experience to guide them." Mr. Craven interprets the colonial movement on the same basis: "To attribute to them [the London adventurers] any idea of creating a body politic either politically or economically independent of the company and of England is to credit them with an idea that is compatible neither with contemporary theories of colonization nor with reason." "To him [Sir Edwin Sandys] the success of Virginia was measured by the degree in which it served the interests of English trade. . . . With characteristic energy and ability he mapped out a

program that in its scope and embodiment of current ideas on the place of a colonial venture in the mercantile scheme of the mother country presents an unusually valuable study of the purposes and hopes which motivated seventeenth century adventurers." This interpretation of the principles upon which the officers and council of the company proceeded is one of Mr. Craven's most valuable contributions.

One other service rendered by this study should be especially noted. To write a history of the corporation, based on the minutes of its proceedings, has led to but little comprehension of the real struggle between the Warwick and the Sandys factions. It is only from the supplementary documents that the true basis of this conflict can be discovered. And this Mr. Craven has done. Out of the tangled mass of scribbled notes, memoranda, drafts of projects, and incriminations found in the Manchester Papers and the official, semi-official, and personal correspondence that constitute the Ferrar Papers, he has unraveled and clearly and concisely presented the situation. To those who have admired the Southampton-Sandys-Ferrar administration of the company, and have been horrified at the Smith-Warwick-Rich calumnies, the author's clear analysis of the contending forces comes as a startling surprise. But it would be difficult to disprove his conclusions.

The study presents a clear statement of the procedure of the company and of its acts, secured from evidence scattered through many pages of difficult manuscript and based on conflicting records. And here also is a careful analysis of the intricate accounts, the varied and numerous joint stock ventures, and especially of the unfortunate business methods and plans of the company. After enumerating a number of these ventures, Mr. Craven continues: "For more expensive projects it was necessary to fall back upon an extension of the practice of subsidiary joint-stocks." But, it "was a hopeless situation. Tobacco alone was produced in sufficient quantities to offer any possibility of payment for these supplies, and its poor quality together with marketing conditions at home offered little prospect of profit. The only hope seemed to be in other commodities, and yet the company was not able, except through this trade of which Sandys wrote, to provide the supplies and conditions of life in Virginia necessary to their development."

The story of the Tobacco Contract as told in chapter VIII. reveals the problems and difficulties the company and its planters faced. It constitutes the concluding history of the Virginia Company. To one who knows the unrelated and confused mass of records forming the source from which the narrative of the tobacco monopoly is drawn, this presentation is a cause of great gratification. Mr. Craven certainly has rendered conspicuous service in his clear, careful, and accurately documented study of this significant chapter of our economic history.

Bryn Mawr College. SUSAN M. KINGSBURY.

Roger Williams, New England Firebrand. By JAMES ERNST. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xiv, 538. $4.00.)

ALTHOUGH the reputation of Roger Williams has been steadily on the rise for a number of years, this is the first effort at a full-length study. The author, who was trained in the liberal tradition of the late Professor Parrington, finds in his subject an admirable opportunity for a vigorous espousal of the radical cause—as against Stuart divine right and the policy of "thorough", and against Puritan theocracy and the policy of persecution. In general, the author is moderate; but occasionally he reveals curiously unguarded flashes of a furious liberalism (pp. 424, 441 ff.).

The early chapters, covering Williams's youth, are of note for their inclusion of material from the Egerton Manuscript. The subsequent sections on Williams's relations with the Bay Colony make a praiseworthy effort to examine both sides. The author believes the cause of banishment was less a matter of Williams's subversive opinions than of his insistence upon "a public venting of them" (pp. 135–136). The significance of Williams as a Civil War pamphleteer, long ago recognized in Masson's *Milton,* receives further substantiation. Incidentally, the author has found an anonymous tract of 1652, *The Examiner Defended,* which he attributes to Williams. For the later years, which have never been adequately treated, the author emphasizes Williams's life-long leadership in the colony of his own founding.

The book limits itself to a factual survey of the public career of Roger Williams. Unfortunately, despite the detailed treatment, one misses a sense of close contact with the inner, human side of Williams himself. Nevertheless, the inclusion of so much material has produced, by sheer cumulative effect, a new and larger portrait of one of the notable figures of the seventeenth century.

Defects of organization and method unfortunately mar the book's usability, and even reliability. The somewhat flamboyant chapter headings rather mystify than inform. The combination of chronological and topical arrangement is, possibly, a necessary evil. But why must one wait for an exposition of Seekerism until nearly the end of the book? The author omits a bibliography of the conventional sort. Footnotes he uses sparingly and virtually never for the purpose of scholarly substantiation of crucial points. Direct page references to the sources of quotations are almost invariably lacking. These omissions, while hardly a disadvantage to the general reader, nevertheless render the book of slight service to the student as an aid to his own research.

In taking the view, in itself highly debatable, that Williams espoused the full principle of religious liberty prior to banishment, the author resorts to a device which is open to serious objection. He selects quotations from *The Bloudy Tenent,* published in 1644, and even from Williams's writings of

1652, and makes use of them as though they represented Williams's position in 1635, *prior* to banishment (pp. 94–96, 113–114). This is hardly a scrupulous application of the historical method.

The combined achievements and deficiencies of the book point to both the possibilities and perplexities which still remain. There is obvious need for a consideration of Williams from the literary side. In the opinion of the reviewer, much that is puzzling would become more understandable if the institutional germinations and peculiar vicissitudes of Roger Williams's experiment were studied with reference to the powerful forces of frontier radicalism. One would like also more light on the development of Williams's early "Fellowship" into the proprietorship; the struggles over the suffrage; the relation of the separation of church and state to the peculiarities of the Rhode Island land system; the difficulties of a federal system of government; and the social fermentations and intellectual climate in the colony of radicals and outcasts.

Wesleyan University. S. H. Brockunier.

Increase Mather: a Bibliography of his Works. By Thomas James Holmes. With an Introduction by George Parker Winship, and Supplementary Material by Kenneth Ballard Murdock and George Francis Dow. Two volumes. (Cleveland: Privately printed. 1931. Pp. xxxii, 711.)

This bibliography, prepared by the librarian of the William G. Mather Library, Cleveland, makes its appeal both to the bibliophile and to the historian. It aims, as the introduction states, to show "what manner of person Mather was, what he accomplished and what he stood for". It is a catalogue of Mather's own works, not of books about him, and it is in addition a compendium of the various editions of his many publications. The compiler presents, for the sake of those who can have access to the original texts, a careful, painstaking list of Mather's writings with facsimile title-page for most of the first editions and descriptions of the variations in later ones. For those who cannot use the originals, there are extracts which are designed to give the significant parts of each production, and notes which are often of essay proportions. The works are arranged alphabetically under first words in the titles, a somewhat cumbersome method for those unfamiliar with the material; for example, an interesting disquisition on dancing is listed under "Arrow", simply because the title is "An Arrow Against Profane and Promiscuous Dancing".

From the standpoint of the historian, perhaps the most valuable feature of the bibliography is the collection of vignettes written by the author under each title. They give in brief form the background of the times, the share of the author in the events of the day, and his purpose in writing the tract or

sermon. Among them one of the finest is that on witchcraft, somewhat concealed from the lay eye by the title, "Cases of Conscience Concerning Evil Spirits". In nineteen pages the compiler sketches the history of the strange phenomenon focussing on Mather's responsibility in sweeping "the superstition of witch-hanging out of New England's courts forever".

These little essays show Mather a man of many crusades, against sin in general, against witchcraft, against certain tenets in the Congregational Church, against what he considered the "oppression" of the mother country. For this reason, much of the material listed in the bibliography is controversial in character. In commenting on works of this type, the compiler has not always succeeded in preserving his neutrality. This is particularly true of the political subjects, which tend to present the point of view of the older New England historians of the school of Palfrey. For the period of 1686–1693, in the latter part of which Mather played so important a rôle as agent at court for Massachusetts, the compiler has used chiefly that prejudiced material by which the New Englanders justified their revolt against Andros, accessible in such collections as the Andros Tracts, to the exclusion of valuable official sources like the governor's commission and instructions, the Dudley and Andros *Records,* the Dominion laws, and the wealth of official correspondence in the Public Record Office. The old point of view is presented in such statements as the following: "It was this same Episcopal Church, which, now forced arbitrarily upon the colonists, became the symbol of the rest of the oppressive acts of Governor Andros, his vacating of titles to land and the imposing of high charges for new patents to the old properties, and the raising of burdensome taxes." It is difficult to see, in the phrases of the governor's commission "that liberty of Conscience be allowed to all persons and that such especially as shall be conformable to the Rites of the Church be particularly countenanced and encouraged" any ground for the statement that the Church of England was forced arbitrarily on the colonists. They were neither required to attend its services nor to support it financially, a freedom which the Puritans themselves did not accord dissenters from Congregationalism in the period of the old charter. Nor is it easy to condemn the taxes as burdensome, when a comparative study of the levies shows that they were lower under Andros than for several years preceding or following his administration. One could cite in answer to the compiler's charge about vacating land titles, the statement of Deane the historian, in 1720, that the new charter confirmed "Titles to their Lands, once [under Andros] for want of some Forms of Legal Conveyance contested".

This bibliography, the most complete which has yet appeared on the subject, is an impressive testimony to the fertility of Mather's mind and to the strength of his religious and political leadership among his contemporaries. One cannot rise from reading the careful notes contained therein, without "admiration for the old Puritan's intelligence, his honesty, and his ability".

Living as he did in an age of religious and political controversies, he could not have escaped participation in them. But he was no petty partisan. To this day he is a subject of controversy, but neither the present nor his contemporary conflicts have succeeded in decreasing the intellectual stature of this "foremost American Puritan".

Mount Holyoke College. VIOLA F. BARNES.

The March of Democracy. By JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS. Volume I., *The Rise of the Union.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1932. Pp. xvi, 428. $3.50.)

MR. ADAMS has been lured by the popularity of *The Epic of America* into writing a still more popular work, one which shall be more a narrative of events than a philosophical interpretation, "tell as accurately and impartially as possible the story of the rise of our nation, touching on as many aspects in as much detail as space permits", and correcting the "faults of omission" that characterized "the old type of history of a generation or two ago" without going to the other extreme of "stressing too much one or another of the factors, such as the economic one, which are rightly considered to be of great influence", and without substituting for "the old 'drum and trumpet' merely the voices and motives of the market place or a picturesque account of manners and arts and thought".

The recurring need of such a book is obvious, but it cannot be said that Mr. Adams's first volume, which comes down to the eve of the Civil War, attains any special distinction in either form or substance. What it offers is, for the most part, straightforward narration of the accustomed chronological kind, much more political and personal than economic, but broken here and there by interesting observations on manners and ways of living, the beginnings and progress of literature and the arts, religious matters, and other non-political topics. Of the "march of democracy", considered as anything more than the well-known procession of events, there is no marked trace, nor does the narrative show any novel grasp of the period as a whole. A suggestion of haste appears in the repetition, at page 286, of Jefferson's epitaph already quoted at page 235, and the text is not wholly free from minor errors. The general proportions, however, are fair, and the reader who does not mind Mr. Adams's prejudices, or his habit of using some incident or situation as a peg on which to hang an expression of opinion about another matter, will find the book readable and informing. The illustrations outdo any recent book of the kind in number, variety, and appropriateness.

Mr. Adams cannot easily let slip an opportunity to criticize New England both during and after the colonial period. The founding of Harvard College, he thinks, "tended to increase the provincialism of New England by encouraging it to keep students at home" (p. 26), while of the "distinguished

group" which included Ticknor, Prescott, Motley, Palfrey, Parkman, Hildreth, and Bancroft, he remarks that "it is odd . . . how little they were concerned for the most part with American history outside of their own provincial section" (p. 333). Colonial coöperation with England in the intercolonial wars, on the other hand, seems to him to have increased "the sum total of irritation between British subjects on the two sides of the water" (p. 50), and he properly emphasizes the differing British and American psychology which developed under colonial conditions, the disfranchisement of various classes of early frontiersmen and the political dominance of a few families, and the effect of the change from the theory of commercial to that of territorial imperialism after the French wars.

Hamilton is severely censured for his attitude toward Adams's cabinet, and Jefferson's political ideas, although not all of his policies, are commended. There is the traditional high praise for the character of the Supreme Court, and John Quincy Adams is acclaimed as "the greatest Secretary of State we have ever had" (p. 277). For the Abolitionists, Mr. Adams has scorn and denunciation. By 1860 the northern Abolitionists "had reached a pitch of fanaticism akin to insanity", and were "neither statesmen nor genuine humanitarians but madmen bent on burning down the whole national structure in a conflagration of hate in order that their own brand of fanaticism might be made to prevail" (p. 404).

A few slips are to be noted. Not all the colonial charters of Charles II. were modeled on the bishopric of Durham (p. 33); the Pennsylvania charter used the manor of Windsor. The Boston Port Act did not in terms close the port to coastwise trade in fuel and provisions (p. 100), and the Administration of Justice Act permitted accused persons to be tried in another colony as well as in England (p. 102). Genêt, who had been in the diplomatic service at London, Vienna, Berlin, and Russia, can hardly be said to have been "ignorant of other nations" (p. 179).

New York City. WILLIAM MACDONALD.

A History of American Economic Life. By EDWARD C. KIRKLAND, Frank Munsey Professor of American History, Bowdoin College. [Crofts American History Series, Dixon Ryan Fox, General Editor.] (New York: F. S. Crofts and Company. 1932. Pp. xv, 767. $3.75.)

IT is now more than a half century since the pioneer works of J. Leander Bishop (*A History of American Manufactures,* 1868) and Albert S. Bolles (*The Industrial History of the United States,* 1878) began the writing of American economic history. Better works followed these. Scores of articles, dissertations, special studies came to pave the way for a new synthesis of American economic life. Professor Kirkland has taken advantage of a real opportunity, and has done exceedingly well. His critical bibliography alone

will stimulate further work in the field. He divides his book into three parts: The Colonial Age, The Agricultural Era, and The Industrial State. It is refreshing to see an American historian write of the British mercantile policy in a dispassionate manner, void of the old cant inherited from the Revolution. Students of agricultural surpluses will find the colonial legislative efforts to regulate the production of tobacco interesting (p. 71). Two or three questions are raised by the treatment of the colonial era. Is not Northern industry more generously treated than its counterpart in the South? Did the Indian have quite the negligible influence on colonial life he is here assigned? Why should the Stamp Act, which was never enforced, be given space and the Molasses Act of 1764, which was in effect for ten years, be ignored? I am disposed to criticize the meager attention given the new colonial policy after the French and Indian War. Either it disturbed the economic life of the colonies or the colonists had little justification for a revolt. In either case it would seem to be a vital portion of the course of colonial economic life.

The terminus of the Agricultural Era is placed "somewhere between 1850 and 1865". Again, as in the first part, the author's effective literary style, wealth of illustrative details, and soundness of judgment are impressive. This is particularly true of his treatment of the problems connected with the struggle for foreign commerce in the first decade of independence. He faces frankly the realities of the situation of the United States. But did he not momentarily slip, when, writing of Jefferson's restrictive policy, he says "this policy lasted until its only feasible alternative, war, was declared against Great Britain in 1812" (p. 219)? Does the old British war-guilt theory still hold? Or were not responsibilities fairly well divided? The handling of slavery in the Old South deserves commendation.

The hardest task that confronted the author was a satisfactory account of recent economic life. Here he has been less successful both in organizing his materials and in maintaining a detached point of view. He exhibits a tendency to yield to the "urge of criticism". He allows himself at times to become a satirical partisan, generally in criticism of policies unpopular with the so-called liberals of to-day. Big business tends to be "predatory", labor never. He refers to the Caribbean policy of Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, and Coolidge as one maintained in an "atmosphere of subterfuge and hypocrisy" (p. 697), a sweeping indictment that fuller knowledge may or may not justify. It would be well to suspend judgment on many aspects of recent history until much more spade work has been done.

Western Reserve University. ELBERT J. BENTON.

Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs, 1831–1860. Selected and Arranged by WILLIAM R. MANNING,

Ph.D., Division of Latin American Affairs, Department of State. Volume I., Argentina. Documents 1–387. (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1932. Pp. xxxvi, 789. $5.00.)

"The publication of which this is the first of probably ten, or possibly more, volumes is a sequel to that of three volumes entitled *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States Concerning the Independence of the Latin American Nations* which was published in 1925, under the same auspices. The earlier compilation . . . covered the period 1810 to 1830, and was confined rather rigidly to the one subject, independence. . . . The present publication, beginning with January, 1831, and extending through three decades to December, 1860, is designed to include all of the documents in the Department of State which have a bearing upon the international relations of the Latin American nations", excepting (1) certain formal, polite, and perfunctory documents; (2) most of the materials relative to pecuniary claims; and (3) a great bulk of documents dealing with commercial controversies and the conclusion of commercial treaties. Correspondence regarding claims is included when such controversies threatened to interrupt harmonious relations, and the same procedure was followed with reference to commercial matters when the question of special favors was involved (preface, p. ix). "No documents have been omitted because of a confidential or indiscreet character or because, if contemporaneously published, they would possibly have given offense or have damaged" reputations. "Not infrequently the subject of an omitted portion has been indicated in a footnote [preface, pp. ix-x]. . . ."

The present volume deals entirely with Argentina. Some of the subsequent volumes will include correspondence with two or more countries. And it is probable that the Mexican materials will require at least two volumes. While most of the documents will doubtless appear in print for the first time in this large collection, many of them have already been published either in the public documents of the United States or in those of the other countries concerned. Such as have already been printed are not readily accessible, however, nor has Dr. Manning found it practicable to indicate where the printed documents may be found.

Such is the general nature and scope of the work of which the volume now under review is the first to appear. That it will be of major importance to all students interested in American diplomacy cannot be questioned. It will constitute a valuable source for the study of this subject, and it will also cast much light upon internal conditions in Latin America during its turbulent formative period. Moreover, it will suggest the urgent need for further investigations in the archives of Latin America, England, France, and Spain. Indeed, the reviewer ventures to express the conviction, based upon considerable research in London, that for the period 1808 to 1860 the British Public Record Office contains a bulk of materials more significant for the

history and diplomacy of Latin America than is to be found in the State Department in Washington.

Part I. of the first volume of Dr. Manning's work consists of sixty-two pages and contains communications to Argentina. Part II., which consumes the remainder of the volume, contains communications from Argentina. The important subjects dealt with are as follows: (1) the Falkland Islands controversy; (2) the intervention of France and England in the Rio de la Plata area; (3) disagreements and rivalries between Argentina, Paraguay, and Brazil with reference to the area; and (4) political disorders in Uruguay and Argentina. While considerable information is presented with reference to such leaders as Rosas, Urquiza, Rivera, and Oribe, the work is somewhat disappointing in this respect. Incidentally, the correspondence does not give a very favorable impression of the diplomats sent by the United States to the region during the period.

The list of documents published at the beginning of the volume gives no indication of the contents of the numerous letters printed. The index, however, is excellent and the footnotes numerous and valuable.

Duke University. J. Fred Rippy.

The Purchase of the Danish West Indies. By Charles Callan Tansill, Professor of American History, American University, Washington, D. C. [The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, 1931, under the Auspices of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations.] (Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins Press. 1932. Pp. xiii, 548. $3.50.)

The story of the attempt by the United States to purchase the Danish West Indian islands from Denmark begins properly with William H. Seward's occupancy of the post of Secretary of State. As soon as the outcome of the Civil War was clear, and while the European complications that had threatened were still fresh in his mind, Secretary Seward began to prepare for the negotiations with Denmark which culminated in the ill-fated treaty of October, 1867. Not until half a century later, when the United States was preparing to intervene in a European war, did Seward's original plan reach a successful culmination. This curious chapter in American imperialism has now been revealed in all its labyrinthine ramifications in Mr. Tansill's exhaustive study. On the basis of a minute and searching examination of official documents, unpublished correspondence in Washington, in Copenhagen, and elsewhere, newspaper dispatches, books and articles by participants in the various episodes along the meandering path, the author has presented the history of the purchase with convincing clarity. A host of prominent figures enter into the story at one stage or another. Among them are Henry Cabot Lodge and his friend Henry White, A. T. Mahan, Admiral

Dewey, political leaders and publicists on both sides of the Atlantic, as well as adventurers like Niels Grön and Captain Christmas. Seward's objective had, by the time of Theodore Roosevelt's presidency, become the official policy of our government. But Denmark's case, as Mr. Tansil[1] conclusively shows, was different. The Danish national resurgence following the loss of Schleswig in 1864, the hope that Germany would some time authorize a plebiscite in north Schleswig, and the attitude of the great powers, were among the factors influencing Danish public opinion. The man upon whom fell the task of striking the bargain at the opportune time was Maurice Francis Egan, minister to Denmark from 1907 to 1918. Dr. Egan has described his own part in two most interesting volumes of memoirs dealing with his diplomatic experiences, *Ten Years near the German Frontier. Recollections of a Happy Life*. The author has used these accounts with excellent discrimination and has filled in the gaps with valuable bits drawn from other sources, such as certain "confidential" and "strictly confidential" letters in the Woolsey manuscripts. The reviewer recalls Dr. Egan's remark to him, made in the course of a visit to the American legation in Copenhagen in the autumn of 1912: "Why, I was sent over here to buy those islands"; and the King of Denmark's joking advice to the writer proffered some months later, that he "write an accurate history, so that when America gets ready to grab the islands, she will know what she is doing!" The minister lived long enough to carry out his mission, and fortunately the United States did not have to resort to a policy of 'grab' in order to acquire them. The oft-repeated assertions of German intrigue to prevent the sale of the islands to the United States, for which the author finds no supporting evidence whatever, were held tenaciously by men like Henry Cabot Lodge and Henry White; so when war with Germany became imminent, both government and people were prepared to pay a huge price for a few square miles of mountain ranges that represent but fragments of the Lesser Antilles.

The University of California at Los Angeles. WALDEMAR WESTERGAARD.

Development of the League of Nations Idea. Documents and Correspondence of Theodore Marburg. Two volumes. Edited by J. H. LATANÉ. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xv, 480; vii, 483–886. $8.00.)

THESE two substantial volumes are the record of an American movement for a league for peace. They represent the recognition on the part of certain Americans of the importance of something more than the old formula of treaties at the close of a war, that there shall be "eternal and lasting peace" between the contracting states, even if that formula were extended into a collective treaty embracing a large number of countries. There must be an organization and there must be some way of guaranteeing peace. It is inter-

esting to notice that the group, which in January, 1915, began the movement, resolved "that it shall be the function of the League to guarantee that no dispute to which any member of the League is a party shall be settled by other than amicable means under penalty of the employment against the offending nation of the united forces of the League" (p. vii). The statesmen, publicists, and university men in the group had such wide relationships abroad that it was not difficult for them to form contact with similar-minded groups of people in other countries, particularly those of the leading Allies in the Great War, and to help crystallize the growing sentiment that the world could not be allowed to drift along the path that led to Armageddon.

The book is made up of extracts from letters and memoranda passing between the principal actors in the American group and between them and Europeans. It is an interesting story of the international development of an idea. The figures that move through the pages are those of men who have molded opinion. Among those in the United States who shared in the effort are notably Presidents Taft and Wilson, Colonel House, Hamilton Holt, A. Lawrence Lowell, Lyman Abbott, Oscar Straus; in Europe, Lord Grey, Lord Balfour, Sir Eric Drummond, Sir C. A. Spring-Rice, and Lord Bryce; Aristide Briand, Léon Bourgeois, Hymans of Belgium, Christian Lange of Norway.

No movement, however, can advance far without having behind it some one or two men who act as its moving force and who centralize the energies, otherwise disparate, of the group. In the case of the League to Enforce Peace, this person was Mr. Theodore Marburg, at one time United States Minister to Belgium, whose devotion to the cause and whose insistence on the principles of the league, make him deserve the place which he holds.

Varied were the developments of the way force should be used. Mr. Marburg on December 30, 1914, found that the American group were not willing to advocate force to sustain the opinions of the World Court, although he comments that there was "almost no dissent when we argue the need of a Court" (p. 12). In a talk with Sir Edward Grey, however, in 1916, that statesman told Mr. Marburg that he thought that if there had been some plan like that of the League of Nations in existence "when the present war threatened, Germany would have been forced to consent to a hearing and there would have been no war". Grey even said that he was ready to stand for the execution of the judgment, provided the people would back him up, and it is interesting to see how very strongly the point was made of the importance of bringing the disputants in a quarrel before a council of conciliation before they go to war. James Bryce wrote in 1915: "War against recalcitrant Power beginning hostilities is easier than war to compel obedience to award of tribunal. It is also easier than war to compel Power to go to arbitration" (p. 76).

The letters continue through the heated period in the United States when

the Senate was considering the Treaty of Versailles. They illustrate the different points of view of those who were pushing for the approval of the treaty and the Covenant, and letters from Europeans reflect the disappointment in that continent over the final refusal of the Senate.

The task of making these selections from Mr. Marburg's great mass of correspondence has been so done by Professor Latané that every extract bears on the main thesis of the volumes.

Columbia University. J. P. CHAMBERLAIN.

The United States and the League of Nations, 1918–1920. By DENNA FRANK FLEMING, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Political Science in Vanderbilt University. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1932. Pp. ix, 559. $5.00.)

EVERY citizen of the United States should read this book, for the great decision of 1918–1920 is operating daily upon the nation's life, and will operate in perpetuity. If Wilson "kept us out of war", his enemies have kept us out of peace! The momentous discussions at Versailles and in the Senate of the United States constitute a supreme landmark in world politics.

The author's sympathies are with Wilson and the League. He condemns the ultranationalists who opposed. Indeed, he discovers that many of them, including Roosevelt, had previously expressed much interest in world federation until partisan considerations dictated another course. Hence the congressional election of 1918 is portrayed in all its nakedness as an unscrupulous bid for power. Illuminating chapters analyze the increasing boldness of the opposition in unleashing their campaign of fear among the people. Also, the *dramatis personæ* are rounded out, the chief actors speaking for themselves, with Porter J. McCumber among the few to rise above partisanship to a concept of the League as a world movement. The opposition gained fresh ammunition from the Shantung Affair and the supposed surrender of the President. It gained, besides, a budget, with Henry C. Frick and Andrew W. Mellon as the financiers of propaganda. Meanwhile, the adventures of the treaty in the Senate revealed the deep lines of cleavage, with unqualified acceptance, mild and serious reservations, and implacable hostility, the chief reactions both in the Senate and in the press.

As the treaty is followed in committee and in the amendments which were offered in August, the drama grows intense. Henry Cabot Lodge continues as the villain, John Sharp Williams as his keen antagonist; the President expounds the treaty, while sensing the fresh dangers that confront it. A sympathetic chapter covers Wilson's Appeal to the People, until "Like the staunchest of men who had served under him, he had fought on until his last ounce of strength was spent, and, like the countless legion of maimed men whose sacrifice he had sought to make supremely fruitful, he was to

spend the rest of his days as a wounded veteran of a great cause". For the prolonged discussion continued throughout the illness of the President, and led to fresh reservations in November and to an abortive effort at a compromise.

The "solemn referendum" in November elicits dignified but ironic comment on the ambiguous position of left-wing versus right-wing Republicans, though justice is done ex-President Taft as placing principles above party. Indeed, Taft appears consistently to excellent advantage, in contrast with Roosevelt, whose selfish motives are revealed with search-light clearness. A brilliant chapter of antithesis completes the portrait of Wilson and Lodge, and the work concludes with some suggestions Toward the Future.

The author chose a scientific rather than a literary presentation. His work becomes a source book, none too easy in the reading. The wealth of quotation, direct or indirect, gives the reader an unusual sense of authenticity, while depriving him of any great æsthetic satisfaction. It is chiefly in the chapter openings and conclusions that one appreciates the temperate judgment of the author and his profound sorrow that the opposition won.

Purdue University. LOUIS MARTIN SEARS.

Archibald Cary Coolidge: Life and Letters. By HAROLD JEFFERSON COOLIDGE and ROBERT HOWARD LORD. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1932. Pp. xiv, 368. $4.50.)

A younger brother of ProfessorArchibald Cary Coolidge of Harvard, himself a graduate of the same college and its Law school, has shared the labors of producing this book with Father Lord, also a graduate of Harvard, a teacher in its department of history from 1910 to 1927, with a full professorship for the last three years, and now, a priest of the Church of Rome, professor of Church history at St. John's Seminary, Brighton. It is strange that the Harvard background of these collaborators did not save them from the slips of designating (p. 11) Boies Penrose a classmate of A. C. Coolidge, of the Class of 1887—Penrose having graduated in 1881—and of alluding (p. 61) to "Archy" as "Class Poet in 1887", which he was not. There are other minor points which invite question—whether the initials A. C. C., frequently used for Coolidge's name in the text, should have been allowed to stray beyond the authors' notes, and whether, in the imposing list of Coolidge's "Travels" from 1884 to 1926 it was quite amusing enough to enter opposite 1913: "Gore Hall, Cambridge, to Randall and Widener Library, back and forth."

These are indeed minor points, and the major points, so often the substantive merits, of the book are better worth noting. It is, in the first place, the record of a remarkable personality and career. Of excellent New England and Virginian ancestry, with Thomas Jefferson for one of his great-

great-grandfathers, and with ample resources to do as he would with his life, he elected to make it laborious and widely useful. The teaching of history at Harvard was his first objective, but while he was still pursuing in Europe the more advanced studies which fell between his Harvard A. B. (*summa cum laude*) and his Freiburg Ph.D., he wrote to his father (p. 18): "After all it is a great thing to be a Harvard instructor, but it is not the only thing in the world. I want to be that, but I want also to be more, a man of experience and cultivation, a man of the world in the broadest sense of the term." That is precisely what he became.

Travel, a lifelong interest with him, was one of the chief means of achieving this end. In 1921 he wrote to his father from Moscow (p. 281): "By the time you get this it will be almost Christmas. In the course of my life I have spent Christmas in Paris, Berlin, Vienna, St. Petersburg, Calcutta, Santiago (Chile), and various places, so Soviet Moscow will not feel particularly strange even if I do not hang up my stocking." All this wandering, merely suggested by his Christmas memorandum, did not preclude, indeed it only supplemented—for it was highly intelligent travel—the studies of a scholar and the teaching of history at Harvard through a period of thirty-five years. To the enlarging influences of travel and scholarship Coolidge could add the advantages of extraordinary contributions to public service. Besides seeing and considering there was also doing—as "acting secretary", while still young, of the United States Legation at St. Petersburg, as a member of "The Inquiry" during the World War, as a "Special Assistant to the Department of State", with a special mission to Vienna, as an expert attached to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace through the final stages of its work, and as a "general political guide" to the staff of the American Relief Administration in Russia in 1921 and 1922. Besides these activities abroad there were the directorship of the Harvard University Library from 1910 till his death in 1928, and the editorship of *Foreign Affairs* through the last six years of his life. What he did for the Harvard Library alone, through his energy, foresight, and generosity, would have constituted a memorable contribution from one man to the enlightenment of his own time and of the future.

On his work in all these relationships his *Life and Letters* throws a flood of light. His letters reveal him faithfully in the varied capacities of son, brother, friend, scholar, and international publicist, and a man of ceaseless, fruitful activity, directed to clearly conceived objects, effectively achieved. A smaller number of letters and a more vigorous abridgment of many that are used might have wrought the same revelation, and more tellingly. It might be argued, moreover, that such inclusions as the three letters from the American consul at Archangel about Russian conditions in 1918 (pp. 184–191)—only one of which communications is addressed to Coolidge himself—and the long letter he received from General Bliss on the subject of disarmament (pp. 262–264), valuable as they are in themselves, are not strictly ger-

mane to either the *Life* or the *Letters* of the subject in hand. Coolidge's own letters during and after the war are excellent, and illuminate both the period and the man, together with his interests; and the man himself was just such "a man of the world in the broadest sense of the term" as he aspired early to become.

Boston. M. A. DeWolfe Howe.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Discovery of the Ancient World. By Harry E. Burton, Professor of Latin in Dartmouth College. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1932, pp. 130, $1.50.) This useful little book is written for the layman, as well as for the professional geographer and classicist. It traces chronologically the extension of geographical knowledge in antiquity from the Egyptians, Cretans, and Phœnicians through the Greeks and Romans down to the time of Ptolemy in the second century A. D.

All controversial matter is excluded, such as the stories of strange lands and peoples told by the ancient writers and their interpretation by modern scholars, which forms the basis of a larger work long under way by the reviewer. A bibliography (pp. 113–119) of works listed in order of publication partly makes up for this, but the index (pp. 123–130) is inadequate, since it contains only the names of geographical localities, but none of geographers and explorers, ancient or modern, who are mentioned in the text.

As the book is largely concerned with statements of fact, it contains little with which one might differ. There is, however, no valid reason for denying the circumnavigation of Africa in the time of Necho, or the attempt over a century later by the Persian Sataspes, both mentioned by Herodotus, and a third attempt made in the first century B. C. by the Greek Eudoxus. Nor is there solid ground for declining to believe that the first two at least may have been known to the Portuguese navigators, either through the Arab schools of Spain, or at least by 1450 when a Latin translation of Herodotus appeared. It is known that Pedro de Covilhao, sent by John II. of Portugal in 1487 to the Levant and contiguous parts of Asia and Africa in search of an overland route to the Spice Islands and the land of Prester John (Abyssinia), reached a point on the east coast of Africa as far south as Zanzibar. This was just before Diaz, in seeking the same countries by sea, discovered the Cape of Good Hope (1488). While in Cairo, Covilhao showed an Arab map of the eastern coast to two Jews who had been sent to find him, and the map was taken to Portugal by one of them. This proves that the Arabs of the Eastern Mediterranean had long been familiar with voyages to the South Cape, and their interest in discovery there may have come ultimately from Greek sources. Thus the first modern circumnavigation of Africa by Vasco da Gama (1497–1498) may well have had its impetus in Herodotus's account of the voyage of Necho.

The University of Pennsylvania. Walter Woodburn Hyde.

The Third and Fourth Dura Hoards. By Alfred R. Bellinger. [Numismatic Notes and Monographs, no. 55.] (New York, The American Numismatic Society, 1932, pp. 85, 20 plates.) The excavations being conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates are proving of great importance to the history of the Hellenistic-Roman period. The campaign begun in November, 1930, yielded from the Priests' House, among other things, two jars of Roman silver coins, the third and fourth hoards thus far discovered at Dura-Europos. These, like the first two hoards, are now described by Professor Bellinger. The coins, over 400 in number, probably constitute a single hoard, since the jars were found near each other and the limits of the series are practically the same (Nero and Diadumenianus, Vitellius and Macrinus), but Bellinger has wisely treated them, for the sake of accuracy, as two separate hoards. The hoards were probably buried in 218, in connection, no doubt, with the confusion produced by Elagabalus.

The description of the coins, which are generously illustrated, is a careful and scholarly piece of work. Bellinger's chief task, indeed his most important contribution, has been to distinguish between the issues of the Antiochene and Roman mints—a difficult matter, since this can be done on the basis of style only. But Bellinger has been able to show that the denarii from the eastern mint have three chief distinguishing marks: (1) the large, rough, and uneven lettering; (2) the clumsy treatment of the eye; (3) the bad proportions of the standing figure, which is usually too short. The Roman coins, on the other hand, show more refinement.

Mints, types, the frequencies of occurrence for the various emperors and other matters are important for the historian as well as for the numismatist. The third and fourth Dura hoards contain some interesting points which are well brought out by Bellinger.

Brown University. C. A. Robinson, jr.

L'Empereur Constantin. Par André Piganiol, Chargé de cours à la Sorbonne. (Paris, Rieder, 1932, pp. 246, 25 fr.) Piganiol's book is a brief but attractively written sketch of Constantine, which in spite of its small dimensions is remarkably compendious. It contains a certain amount of documentation, though occasionally one could wish for more. The biographer's chief interest is in the personality of the sovereign, and a considerable space is devoted to a review of Constantine's legislation, which is quite interesting and well set forth. In a subject so controversial as the career of the first Christian emperor it is natural that the reader should not always agree. M. Piganiol's discussion of Constantine's conversion seems to make the matter unduly complex by postulating a pagan vision *ca.* 310, afterwards worked over by the Christian historians. The break with Licinius does fall about 319/320, but the inscription from Syria of 319 (pp. 129–130) is of a heretical group, as

Harnack pointed out, and thus confirms the statements of our sources that Licinius first showed his estrangement from Constantine by favoring the non-orthodox sects. One misses a mention of the real problem of primacy in Egypt which underlay the Arian conflict, as to who should control the back-country bishops, which Eduard Schwartz elucidated so brilliantly. The impulses behind the Donatist upheaval are not given, nor is the synod of Antioch in 324 properly evaluated. In general the ecclesiastical side of Constantine's activities is less well set forth than his secular activities. A set of eight well-chosen plates increases the attractiveness of the book, which forms an excellent introduction to the study of its hero's life.

Harvard University. ROBERT P. BLAKE.

Das Schlagwort vom "Finisteren Mittelalter". Von Dr. Lucie Varga. [Veröffentlichungen des Seminars für Wirtschafts- und Kulturgeschichte an der Universität Wien, herausgegeben von Alfons Dopsch, no. 8.] (Vienna, Verlag Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1932, pp. 152, 13 M.) The extent to which the word medieval is used to-day as a synonym for backward, benighted, or besotted, by newspaper reporters, politicians on the stump, preachers, and reforming pedagogues, who know substantially nothing about the Middle Ages, has long been noticed without equanimity by this reviewer. In her little book Dr. Lucie Varga makes clear how "medieval darkness" has become a cliché, a commonplace, which records the results of a millenium of polemics. She traces the history of the conception from its early origin down to the *Aufklärung* and the dawn of Romanticism. The early medieval critics of the medieval Church began it and the Italian humanists extended it to things cultural. The Lutherans took over the broadened idea, incorporated it in their school programs, and pushed it along as part of their warfare against the old Church. The natural "scientists", exalting direct observation, in turn helped the depreciatory conception forward, as did the deists. The *Aufklärung* added the element of political and social stupidity to the gloomy picture in their fight against the Old Régime. The Positivists softened the antagonism somewhat with Comte's thesis that the theological was a necessary stage in the inevitable evolution of mankind, but even Goethe could not completely emancipate himself from the derogatory view. Dr. Varga's scholarship is broad and penetrating. She has read widely and wisely in the original sources and the modern literature, and her "quotational" exposition of the opinions of the great men of the past on the darkness of the Middle Ages illuminates many a corner. Her chapter bibliographies will be found useful even by professional medievalists. The *Fachleute* in all lands will not overlook this clearly-written, unambiguous work of the presumably young Viennese scholar.

G. C. S.

Geschiedenis van de Noord-Nederlandsche Geschiedschrijving in de Middeleeuwen. Bijdrage tot de Beschavingsgeschiedenis. Door Dr. Jan Romein. (Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink and Son, 1932, pp. xxxi, 248, 7.50 fl.) It is perhaps not surprising that the northern Netherlands, which have produced very few historians of international fame, should likewise have lagged behind in the science of historiography. The very first work dealing with the writing of history in the Low Countries north of the Rhine appeared in 1932: it is the book now under discussion. It is true that an attempt was made about the year 1830 to prepare such a work, but this production was never completed. Early in the present century there appeared the excellent guide by L. D. Petit, of which the third volume was published in 1928; but it is no more than a list of books and articles, although it deserves to be more widely known in this country than Pirenne's bibliography.

We have at last been favored with a Dutch work on bibliography as well as historiography that will stand the test of scholarship and historical research. It covers the period from 800 to 1500; let us hope that a similar work will appear in due time for the modern period. The ten chapters into which this book has been divided are devoted to eight groups or schools of historians and two types of chronicles. The first group is called the Utrecht School (800–1350), the second the Egmond Circle (1125–1325), the third the Frisian Circle (1200–1300), the fourth the Holland-Utrecht Circle (1350–1480), the fifth the writers of Holland from 1350 to 1490, the sixth the Gelderland Circle (1420–1515), the seventh the Frisian writers from 1400 to 1517, the eighth the Circle of the Devotio Moderna (1440–1517). The two groups of chronicles are those dealing with the nobility and the cities.

Perhaps this arrangement may be deemed somewhat arbitrary, but it almost has to be, because so little of this kind of work has ever been done before in The Netherlands. For example, twenty-four out of ninety-four numbers or sections have been reserved for the Devotio Moderna, and almost one-fourth of the whole book. Less than ten years ago this would have seemed ridiculous to practically all Dutch historians, since this movement had scarcely been regarded as a part of Dutch history. Pirenne paid some slight attention to it and Fruin and Blok practically none. "The history of historiography", so writes Mr. Romein, "is in The Netherlands a neglected subdivision of history." His task was difficult because very few had led the way, but his industry and the assistance of learned archivists and librarians enabled him to prepare a manual which will be indispensable to anyone who is seriously interested in the history of the Low Countries during the Middle Ages.

The University of Michigan. ALBERT HYMA.

Recherches sur les Tribunaux de Châtellenie en Flandre avant le Milieu du XIII^e Siècle. Par François L. Ganshof, Professeur à l'Université de Gand.

[Universiteit te Gent, Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit der Wijsbegeerte en Letteren, 66e Aflevering.] (Antwerp, De Sikkel, 1932, pp. 103.) For many years after the appearance of L. A. Warnkoenig's *Flandrische Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte* little was written about the political and judicial organization of the county of Flanders. This is remarkable because the development of trade and industry and the growth of towns were more rapid and extensive within its borders than in any other medieval European principality north of the Alps. Professor Pirenne's work is of course known to all historians. In recent years excellent monographs have appeared such as H. Nowé's study of the count's bailiffs of Flanders (1928), W. Blommaert's work on Flemish castellans (1915). This little study by Professor Ganshof, Professor Pirenne's successor at the University of Ghent, deals only with the courts in the castleries of Flanders before 1250. Data for the earlier period studied were difficult to find, simply because most of the documents have disappeared. For the later period much more information is available. The author has prepared an excellent study in spite of great limitations. A most imposing mass of documents scattered in many books or still reposing in archives has been studied. Chronicles and monographs have been used wherever possible. Each castlery is treated in detail. In some castleries the judicial tribunal was composed of a simple bench of *scabini*. In others, two tribunals, the bench of *scabini* and a feudal *curia* functioned together. In another category only a feudal *curia* and no *scabini* existed. The author holds, without doubt correctly, that these *scabini* are lineally descended from the territorial *scabini* of the Carolingian age. The existence of a feudal *curia* either alone or with a bench of *scabini* is difficult to explain. The number of free men was quite limited and it is thought that the *scabini* were more and more recruited from them and that the feudal *curia* originally was a bench of territorial *scabini*. A section of the book discusses the competence of the courts, procedure, place of session, time of meeting, and other points of interest. A map of the county showing the castleries is added.

The University of Washington. H. S. Lucas.

The Parliamentary Representation of the English Boroughs during the Middle Ages. By May McKisack, M. A., B. Litt., Lecturer in Medieval History in the University of Liverpool, late Scholar and Fellow of Somerville College, Oxford. [Oxford Historical Series.] (New York, Oxford University Press, 1932, pp. xii, 180, $3.50.) "This book", the author tells us, "is concerned with one limited aspect of English parliamentary history. It is an attempt to correlate some of the evidence bearing on the representation of the towns in the medieval parliament, to discover how the citizens and burgesses were elected, paid, and taxed, what their function in parliament was, and what type of men they were." The statement is clear and accurate—like the rest of Miss McKisack's essay.

The opening chapters assemble statistics concerning borough representation and so introduce the "problem of attendance". Miss McKisack shows that there was no great falling off in the number of represented towns during the fourteenth century, and that in the fifteenth the average was considerably increased. She finds no evidence to warrant the belief that the boroughs were reluctant to send deputies and commonly evaded their responsibility. And she cites municipal records to refute the argument advanced by Mr. Pollard and others that but few of the burgesses elected to Parliament ever appeared there.

The later chapters present much interesting detail with regard to local methods of electing and paying members, the persons chosen, and their manifold duties. Significant facts are brought out concerning the nature and influence of the burgess estate as a whole. In the House of Commons the burgesses were not so thoroughly subordinated to the knights as has been thought. Neither the official rolls, which continued to be inspired by the tradition of Parliament as a court of justice, nor the chroniclers, who were preoccupied with doings of the great, give an adequate account of burgess activity in Parliament. To correct the picture we must turn to borough records. We know that the support of the towns was indispensable for efficient taxation and the regulation of trade, and that these matters were of increasing importance to the English government in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It was apparently the borough members who were chiefly responsible for the mercantile and fiscal policy of Parliament.

Miss McKisack has attempted no thorough discussion of the greater problems involved in parliamentary history, but she has clearly recognized that such problems exist. Furthermore, she has definitely proved that, before they can be solved, neglected materials in borough archives must be taken into careful account.

Cornell University. CARL STEPHENSON.

Peter Abailard. By J. G. Sikes, M. A., Sometime Scholar of Jesus College, Cambridge, Lecturer at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury. With a Preface by the Reverend A. Nairne, D. D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press; New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. xvi, 282, $4.00.) The author's aim, as stated in the preface, is to make a "study of Abailard's life and thought"; in reality it is his *thought-life* that is under consideration. Even in chapters I. (Abailard's Career to the Council of Sens) and IX. (The Council of Sens and After), human interest and individual personalities are eclipsed by painstaking analysis of theological ideas and dialectical processes. Throughout, Abailard's logical and theological development holds the center of the stage. There are chapters (II. to VIII.) on Faith and Reason, Use of Pre-Christian Writers, *Sic et Non,* Logical Theories, The Doctrine of God and Creation,

The Trinity and the Person of Christ, and Ethical Theories and the Atonement; all of them substantial in thought. Its pages are packed with detailed quotations, paraphrases, and analyses of Abailard's ideas and methods of reasoning. The appendixes and footnotes are also laden with citations, criticisms, and excerpts from the original Latin.

Throughout 275 closely printed pages, Mr. Sikes emphasizes the predominantly conservative trend of Abailard's thought. To him, Abailard was a Defender of the Faith and "no rationalist in the Voltairian sense". On the whole he seems to manifest too keen a tendency to deflate the traditionally radical Abailard. He insists, quite rightly, that "he cannot now be said to have been so important in the history of scholastic method as critics once thought". Most scholars will agree that he was not the originator of the scholastic disputation; it had been employed informally by earlier scholars, and was not formally established until after his time. Likewise, canonists for some time had been using the *sic-et-non* method and it was probably Alger of Liège, rather than Abailard, who influenced Gratian. So far, so good. But Abailard's reputation is reduced to the vanishing point when he is made only "negatively influential in the development of mediaeval theology". His only innovation, according to Mr. Sikes, was "a preoccupation with the value of quoting the opinions of authority". Even this dubious praise is qualified by the explanation that it was Peter Lombard who popularized this method.

The final impression of this reviewer is that Mr. Sikes has, in a scholarly manner, accomplished his main purpose of setting forth Abailard's thought-life. But, advertently or inadvertently, he has also performed a drastic work of destruction; he has completely demolished Abailard's reputation as an innovator, not only of theological ideas, but also of logical methods. Whether such deflation is deserved or necessary, is perhaps an open question.

The University of North Carolina. L. C. MacKinney.

A Brief Summe of Geographie. By Roger Barlow. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by E. G. R. Taylor, D.Sc., F. R. G. S. [Works issued by the Hakluyt Society, volume LXIX, second series.] (London, printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1932, pp. lvi, 210, £1 11*s.* 6*d.*) The original of this work, produced in 1540–1541 in an unsuccessful attempt to secure royal support for the opening of an all-English trade route to the East Indies via the Arctic Ocean, has lain in the British Museum, almost untouched for generations, as Royal MSS. 18. B. xxviii. Its neglect has been due, in part, to the fact that it is not a narrative of discovery but rather a historical geography describing the then known world, coast by coast, as a practical handbook for explorers. Likewise, because it consists quite largely of a translation of Martin Fernandez de Enciso's well-known *Suma de Geographia,* students have tended to ignore it.

Its interest arises from its being the earliest account of the New World in English and from its author, Roger Barlow, long in the Spanish trade at Seville and a supercargo on the Spanish South Sea expedition commanded by Sebastian Cabot in 1526, being the first Englishman to visit the Paraná basin when loss of the flag ship and rumors of a wealthy native state to the west (the Inca empire) brought about the abandonment of original plans.

Its chief value lies in the original matter supplementing Enciso's *Suma,* notably a lengthy account of the La Plata country, based on Barlow's personal experiences there. This of itself amply justifies publication of the whole. As the manuscript bears no title, the editor supplied the one used from a phrase employed by the author.

The volume suffers from the usual poor binding and abominable indexing marring Hakluyt Society volumes.

The George Washington University. LOWELL JOSEPH RAGATZ.

History of Russia from the Earliest Times to the Rise of Commercial Capitalism. By Professor M. N. Pokrovsky. Translated and edited by J. D. Clarkson, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of History, Brooklyn College, and M. R. M. Griffiths, M. A. (New York, International Publishers, 1931, pp. xvi, 383, $3.50.) The late M. N. Pokrovsky was the recognized leader of the Marxist historians in Russia and the American student who wishes to become familiar with the prevailing tendency of the present-day Russian historiography should welcome the publication of Pokrovsky's work in English. The present volume, first published before the World War, does not reflect the later development of his methods, nor those of his associates. The Marxist point of view as expressed in this book appears in its pre-war aspect and not in the recent Moscow version. While Pokrovsky's *History of Russia* is certainly an outstanding work of scholarship, the first part of it (which alone is as yet available in English) is less valuable than the second which deals with the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The special preface to the American edition is an illustration of the later methods used by Pokrovsky and his associates, which are hardly favorable to the development of historical science. It is utterly unfair to characterize, as he does, all of the Russian non-Marxist historians as "landlord historians" who have "treated contemptuously the Muzhik". This is certainly a stupefying statement in view of the fact that generations of Russian historians directed their research to the study of the history of the Russian peasant and that they were moved in their work not alone by the pure scientific spirit, but by their profound sympathy with the peasant class in Russia. It was the same peasant problem which had usually attracted the attention of those Russian scholars who studied the history of countries other than Russia. It is characteristic that the Russian Uspensky was a pioneer in the study of the

history of peasants of the Byzantine empire and that another Russian, Kareev, was a leading authority in the problems of the history of French peasantry.

Yale University. GEORGE VERNADSKY.

Oliver's Secretary: John Milton in an Era of Revolt. By Dora Neill Raymond, Ph. D., Professor of History, Sweet Briar College. (New York, Minton, Balch and Company, 1932, pp. xiv, 341, $3.50.) For the greater part of his life Milton was known, not as a poet, but as a brilliant pamphleteer in the cause of the Puritans in the English revolutionary era. This has provided Mrs. Raymond with the main theme of her book. Although the book is an account of Milton's life including his poetical career, the author's chief interest is in an analysis of his political controversies and services and in the development of his political, social, and ethical ideas. Mrs. Raymond is a gifted writer and to her subject she has evidently given mature reflection. The result is a biography of Milton written with a fine understanding—a book with many brilliant passages full of acute observations and sage comments.

Mrs. Raymond's study seems to confirm the view that Milton was not a political theorist of the first order like his contemporary Hobbes, for he did not deal with some of the theoretical questions necessary to a complete political system. He was, however, a profound thinker on certain political and social problems. Into those problems which touched him most closely, such as divorce and freedom of the press, he had the deepest insight. He was an eloquent exponent of the view that liberty is not so much an inalienable right as a privilege to be earned. On this and other questions Mrs. Raymond makes it clear that he speaks directly to modern times. For, although he is linked with the Puritans in his intense seriousness and his reverence for Scripture, the sheer virility of his mind breaks through the restraining disciplines of his age. In his great poem he is not really interested in the immutable decrees of God but in the conflict of reason and passion. And his greatest poetical creation is the figure of Satan.

But Mrs. Raymond has not concealed from us the vigor of his prejudices. At least two of his deepest convictions are distinctly limiting to his vision. These are his vehement and relentless anti-feminism and his contempt for the masses, that "inconstant, irrational and hapless herd, begotten to servility". But when we have rejected his narrow views and discounted some of the vituperative language natural to a seventeenth century controversialist, there remain in Milton's political writings ideas which have not ceased to deserve the matchless expression he gave to them.

Mrs. Raymond carries her discriminating observations into the period of the Restoration when Milton had achieved a calm of mind without having spent his passion. He could no longer serve the state but he could use his statesman's experience in writing his poems. On this subject Mrs. Raymond

shows herself to be a competent literary critic as well as a student of history and political ideas.

The reviewer found few slips or misprints. In the footnotes are included valuable bibliographical comments.

The University of Rochester. WILLSON H. COATES.

The Secretaries of State, 1681–1782. By Mark A. Thomson, M. A., D. Phil., Assistant Lecturer in History, University College, London. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1932, pp. 206, $3.00.) This small book takes up the story of the secretary of state where Mrs. Higham left it and is a useful addition to our knowledge of eighteenth century British administration. One must not be misled by the fond assertion on the jacket, that it offers a detailed survey of "the relation of the Secretaries of State to the King, the First Lord of the Treasury, and Parliament". Dr. Thomson set himself narrower limits. He has lifted about as completely as it could be done the office of secretary out of the rest of the government. He is interested in the quality and political fortunes of the men who filled it, in the relation between the secretary for the northern department and the one for the southern, and in the attitude of both towards any diminution of their powers and emoluments by the creation of a third secretary for Scotland or for the colonies. Most of the documents in the appendix bear on this last point. Very dubious at times seems to have been the adherence to that fine definition that there is but one office of secretary, no matter how many secretaries there may be. A good chapter on internal organization shows the staff as the secretary's personal employees and not public officials—a practice lingering on from the days when he himself was the king's private servant. The bulk of the book deals with the varied functions of the office and describes better than has been done before the skeleton outline of the system, the bewildering multiplicity of tasks in Scottish, Irish, colonial, military and naval, foreign and domestic business. Much documentary evidence is presented, with the gaps clearly stated. The student fitting together his own picture of king, cabinet, ministers, and Parliament will find here something to help him, but to draw that picture himself was evidently not the author's plan.

Yale University. S. M. PARGELLIS.

The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers. By Carl L. Becker, John Stambaugh Professor of History in Cornell University. [The Storrs Lectures at Yale University] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932, pp. 168, $2.00.) In this little volume Professor Becker throws up in grand perspective three systems of thought: medieval, eighteenth century, and modern. After a few words on the nature of opinions and arguments, he quotes a summary passage from St. Thomas to the effect that "all things

subject to Divine Providence are ruled and measured by the eternal law". Then against that neatly polished conception, he sets the fundamental idea of the *Philosophes*. He shows of course and quite properly that the *Philosophes* were in reality not philosophers at all. They did not write heavy treatises on epistemology to display a talent for the passionless pursuit of passionless truth, but were optimists with faith in the on-the-whole beneficence of nature and nature's God and they had a reforming message to deliver. Having planted the eighteenth century idea firmly on a pedestal of authentic documentation, Professor Becker erects in another corner of his museum the conception of modern physics, commenting laconically that "it has taken eight centuries to replace the conception of existence as divinely composed and purposeful drama by the conception of existence as blindly running flux of disintegrating energy". Thus it would appear that, viewed in correct perspective, Voltaire and St. Thomas are to be bracketed together as cheerful believers in an excellent universe which modern physics has condemned by the second law of thermodynamics.

In respect of this age-long controversy Professor Becker takes a neutral position. Well aware of the tricks which have been played with history, he does not propose to be caught red-handed manufacturing a false theory of his own or committing himself whole-heartedly to any modern version of optimistic faith. He therefore closes with a question: Is mankind marching by stages toward perfection or stumbling around in a circle?

Such is the dilemma to which the relativity of the modern historical school inevitably leads. As Kurt Riezler says, in his essay on *Idee und Interesse in der Politischen Geschichte*, an escape, if there is one, must be through another form of attack: "Der Knoten, der nicht zu lösen ist, muss durchhauen werden" (*Die Dioskuren*, 1924, p. 5). But until the knot-cutter has arrived, Professor Becker's statement of the problem will remain a classic—a beautifully finished literary product.

New Milford, Connecticut. CHARLES A. BEARD.

La Constitution Britannique devant l'Opinion Française de Montesquieu à Bonaparte. Par Gabriel Bonno, Ancien Élève de l'École Normale Supérieure, Agrégé de l'Université. (Paris, Champion, 1932, pp. iii. 317, 50 fr.) As a collection of opinions regarding the British constitution expressed in French (whether written in France or not) between about 1748 and 1789, M. Bonno's book is quite thorough. A careful index of authors makes it as easy to consult as a catalogue; and it is rendered easily intelligible by a convenient arrangement into periods—1748 to 1756, when French opinion was predominantly Anglophile; 1756–1763, when war made it predominantly Anglophobe; 1763–1778, when admiration tempered by criticism became the characteristic note in French discussions of English institutions; 1778–1783, when sympathy for the American colonies displaced Anglomania; and 1783–

1789, when Britain's constitution, and particularly its system of justice, regained lost esteem. The years from 1789 to 1799 are not so satisfactorily canvassed. Secondary works as pertinent as Aulard's *Histoire Politique de la Révolution Française,* Redslob's *Staatstheorien der Französischen Nationalversammlung,* and Liljegren's *A French Draft Constitution of 1792 modelled on James Harrington's Oceana* do not seem to have been consulted; contemporary periodicals are only sparsely cited; contemporary writings as relevant as Marat's *Chaines d'Esclavage,* Clermont-Tonnerre's *Analyse Raisonnée de la Constitution Française,* and Condorcet's several Revolutionary pamphlets receive little or no consideration. In this section, too, the author falls more often into the easy tendency to attribute to "influence" mere similarities that may have had no direct causal relationship.

There are, however, two distinct weaknesses that characterize the book as a whole. In the first place, M. Bonno's *literati* move in altogether too rarified an atmosphere. One would never guess that eighteenth century writers were frequently subsidized by persons with ulterior motives, or ever expressed opinions not strictly dictated by intellectual conviction; propaganda, politics, and class interests are mentioned only casually, if at all. In the second place, M. Bonno's republic of letters is altogether too democratic, for he makes no effort to apportion space according to the relative significance of the writers discussed. Why should writers like, for example, Pierre Caze, himself an Anglophobe, receive more attention than Helvetius, Dupont, Condorcet, Brissot, Marat, and other critics of the English constitution? The book has several minor errors, some of which a list of errata rectifies.

The University of Chicago. LOUIS GOTTSCHALK.

Saint-Just, Apostle of the Terror. By Geoffrey Bruun, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in New York University. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932, pp. 168, $2.50.) It is singular that until the publication of the brief sketch here reviewed, there has been no account in English and no recent or satisfactory life in French of one of the most important and dramatic figures in the Revolution. The work of Saint-Just as political theorist, practical politician, eloquent orator, fiery representative at the front, one of the two or three chief men in France at the height of the Terror, has never been adequately studied. Toward the filling of this gap, Mr. Bruun has given us an excellent condensed summary of the essential facts, written in a graceful, pleasing style. The method is in general factual rather than interpretative. In the reviewer's opinion there are certain gaps in the treatment, which may be accounted for in part by the fact that the book does not purport to be a definitive biography. On the other hand, the reviewer is in general agreement with the position taken by the author toward his subject and has very little quarrel with his narrative of the facts. A few points are open either to definite criticism or to a difference of opinion. Doubt as to the

authenticity of the physician's letter in connection with the silver robbery was not expressed by Saint-Just's mother (p. 7), but by D'Evry in a letter to the police, September 29, 1786. The pamphlet referred to on page 16 criticized the assembly for a decree refusing to declare definitely that the Catholic Church was the state religion, not for confiscation of Church property. The point of the Scaevola legend is missed (p. 17); the tale was circulated that Saint-Just held his hand in, not over the fire, though the latter was what really happened. Carnot did not bury himself in his bureau, "half-ignored by his colleagues" (p. 60); his signature is to be found on decrees of every description. Saint-Just was not concerned chiefly with constitutional legislation in the second committee of public safety (p. 61), but with military and police matters. In the reviewer's opinion, the author understates Saint-Just's connection with the military successes in the North (p. 118). A number of slips are probably due to the proof reader; Thuillier is always given, even in the index, as Thullier; Coucy as Courci. The bibliography and index are good and the book is well documented. The author has managed to include a great deal of material in a very compact form; he has produced a scholarly and well-written study.

Goucher College. EUGENE N. CURTIS.

Sir Robert Wilson, a Soldier of Fortune in the Napoleonic Wars. By Giovanni Costigan, Associate Professor of History, University of Idaho, Southern Branch. [University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History, no. 16] (Madison, 1932, pp. 277, $2.00.) Wilson was what a soldier hero should be: tall, handsome, high-spirited, dashing, courageous; possessing great charm and the happy faculty of making friends. An associate described him as "one of the most harum-scarum fellows that ever lived; yet there is an immense deal of good in him and much sound judgment. . . . Better tempered it is hardly possible to be." His charm attracted royalty itself. While attached to the Prussian mission in 1806 he met the Czar Alexander, who "putting all formality aside, liked nothing better than to hear Wilson rattle on with his flow of anecdotes and joke away as with a fellow trooper". After a stirring experience in the Peninsular War, Wilson appears in varied missions, as military adviser to the British ambassador at Constantinople, in St. Petersburg for the Russian campaign of 1812, and at Leipzig, where victory was chiefly due, Schwarzenberg, the Austrian commander declared, "to the intelligence and able dispositions of Wilson". After the war a venture in English politics was fraught with unfortunate results to his personal interests. Because of his liberal attitude, his foreign decorations were recalled, and when he championed the cause of Queen Charlotte, he was cashiered. But, as with other romances, all ended well. Restored to the army with high rank, and his decorations returned, he spent his last years happily as governor of Gibraltar, where "resplendent with decorations he lorded it over his infant court".

Mr. Costigan has done an excellent piece of work and has told his story well.

The Library of Congress. A. R. Boyd.

"1830": Études sur les Mouvements Libéraux et Nationaux de 1830. Publiées sous les Auspices du Comité Français des Sciences Historiques et par les Soins de la Société d'Histoire Moderne. (Paris, Rieder, 1932, pp. xi, 226, 25 fr.) These studies make no attempt to treat the revolutionary movement of 1830 comprehensively. Of the seventeen papers, six are devoted to the revolution in various provincial cities of France, three concern Belgium, and two are on Poland. Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill of 1832 in England, and the German and Italian movements of the period are omitted entirely, which is surprising considering the title of the book.

The study of most general interest is the first, 1830 dans l'Évolution Constitutionnelle de l'Europe, by B. Mirkine-Guetzévitch. The author shows that the political life of the Restoration in the states that had written constitutions centered in the conflict between the new system of parliamentary government and the administrative personnel who clung to the ideas and practices of the *Ancien Régime.* The significance of the revolutionary movement of 1830 lies chiefly in these two results; that it everywhere clarified the prevailing ideas of the nature of ministerial responsibility, and that in France it brought in a new administrative personnel. The French Charter of 1814 as modified in 1830 and the Belgian constitution of 1831 embodied these changes, and in the succeeding decades both documents had a great influence throughout the Continent. This influence is dominant in the following constitutions: of Spain (1837), Portugal (1838), Greece (1844), Naples, Rome, and Holland (1848), and of Roumania (1866). This same study contains a number of other interesting observations on the political movements of the early nineteenth century on the Continent, and is perhaps the best brief commentary available on the significance of the revolutions of 1830. The studies of the Belgian and Polish movements are valuable contributions, particularly that of M. Handelsman on L'État Actuel des Études relatives à l'Histoire de 1830–1831 en Pologne.

Oberlin College. Frederick B. Artz.

L'Expédition de Chine de 1860: Souvenirs du Général Cousin de Montauban, Comte de Palikao. Publiés par son Petit-fils, le Comte de Palikao. (Paris, Plon, 1932, pp. 450, 40 fr.) In November, 1859, Napoleon III. appointed General Charles Cousin de Montauban to be commander-in-chief of the French expedition which was being assembled for the renewal of the Anglo-French war against China. After 1871 General de Montauban—then Comte de Palikao— applied himself to the task of compiling, from his private papers and the official documents in his possession, an account of the year and

a half covered by his Far Eastern tour of duty. Now, fifty-four years after the general's death, the third Comte de Palikao presents the world with an intelligently edited and decidedly readable volume of his grandfather's recollections.

The student of Far Eastern history will find in the volume little cause for altering, in its main aspects, the traditional account of the 1860 expedition. Especially in those parts devoted to the purely military phases of the allied undertaking, Montauban's story differs only slightly from that provided by the British sources upon which we have hitherto been so largely dependent.

The account of the actual campaign, however, occupies but a comparatively small portion of the volume. At the time of his appointment General de Montauban had suggested that, in addition to being made commander-in-chief, he should also be vested with full diplomatic powers. Although this proposal was rejected by the French emperor, various circumstances made impossible a complete dissociation of diplomatic and military functions. Throughout his service in China, therefore, Montauban continued to feel himself responsible, diplomatically as well as militarily, for the Far Eastern interests of his country, and his dispatches to the minister of war deal quite as fully with his views on diplomatic matters as with the military operations entrusted to him. The encouragement of French commerce with China, the improvement of the national prestige at Shanghai, the strengthening of the protectorate over Catholic missions, the advantage to be taken of the Taiping Rebellion, and the need for improving France's position in Japan are all discussed at great length. But most important of all, in Montauban's opinion, was the necessity of securing for France the island of Chusan as a base of operations and as an offset to Britain's foothold at Hongkong. This conviction, amounting almost to an obsession, pervaded his dispatches to the war office, inspired him with an increasing anglophobia, and eventually brought him to the verge of an open break with the French plenipotentiary, Baron Gros.

Simmons College. G. Nye Steiger.

Le Bureau du Roi, 1848–1873: le Comte de Chambord et les Monarchistes. Par Marquis de Noailles. (Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1932, pp. 277, 12 fr.) To the Marquis de Noailles, editor of *Le Comte Molé, 1781–1855: sa Vie, ses Mémoires,* the second and third volumes of which were reviewed in this journal (XXIX. 598; XXX. 360), we are indebted for additional valuable notes and papers of Comte Molé throwing light upon the attempts at fusion of the two monarchist parties, Legitimist and Orleanist, during the Second Republic and the first years of the Second Empire. In this volume, Noailles includes also interesting notes and papers of his great uncle, the Marquis de La Ferté-Meun, a member from 1850 to 1870 of the *Bureau du Roi.* The organization, with a headquarters in Paris, was founded to protect

the interests of the Comte de Chambord and work for his return to the throne. It broke up in despair after his manifesto of July 5, 1871, ending *"Henri V ne peut abandonner le drapeau blanc d'Henri IV"*. On the basis of these papers and other evidence, the editor believes that fusion was wrecked in 1850 by the obstinacy of the Orleans princes who refused to join their cousin, although France would have welcomed the restoration of the older Bourbon line with its trappings and its absolutism. The success of the plebiscites which followed a year or two later showed the country to be favorable to a slightly limited autocracy. In 1871, on the other hand (but not in 1873, it was then too late), the situation was reversed. The Comte de Chambord, deluded by a romantic mysticism, could not grasp the fact that again France would accept him, but only as a parliamentary ruler.

Both sets of papers, now printed in full for the first time, include many letters to and from the exiled Bourbons and notes of talks with them and other exalted personages. While no markedly new facts are revealed, the sad story becomes clearer with its successive chapters of misunderstandings and blighted hopes. Students of the history of nineteenth century France will thank the Marquis de Noailles for the publication of the documents and for the scholarship and grace with which he has edited them.

Princeton University. HENRY R. SHIPMAN.

La Population de la France pendant la Guerre: la Guerre et la Vie Sociale. Par Michel Huber, Directeur de la Statistique Générale de la France. [Economic and Social History of the World War, James T. Shotwell, Ph.D., LL.D., General Editor, Série Française.] (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932, pp. xii, 1025, 165 fr.)

Die Einwirkung des Krieges auf Bevölkerungsbewegung, Einkommen und Lebenshaltung in Deutschland. Von Dr. Rudolf Meerwarth, Dr. Adolf Günther, Dr. Waldemar Zimmermann. [Deutsche Serie.] (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932, pp. xv, 474, 22 M.)

The Cost of the War to Russia: the Vital Statistics of European Russia during the World War, 1914–1917. By Stanislas Kohn, Assistant Professor of Statistics, Russian School of Laws, Prague, formerly Assistant Director, Russian Agricultural Census. *Social Cost of the War.* By Baron Alexander F. Meyendorff, D. C. L., formerly Vice-President of the Duma, Reader in Russian Institutions and Economics, University of London. [Russian Series.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932, pp. xv, 215, $3.25.)

Die Industrie Oesterreichs während des Krieges. Von Richard Riedl, Ehemaliger Generalkommissar für Kriegs- und Uebergangswirtschaft. [Oesterreichische und Ungarische Serie.] (Vienna, Hölder, Pichler, Tempsky; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932, pp. xxiii, 374, 12.50 M.)

Taxation during the War. By Sir Josiah Stamp, G.B.E., LL.D., D.Sc., Sc.D., F.B.A. [British Series.] (London, Humphrey Milford; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932, pp. xiv, 249, 10*s*.) Three of these books are devoted chiefly to showing the influence of the World War upon the vital statistics of France, Germany, and Russia, respectively. Deaths rose and births fell in all of these countries as hostilities were prolonged. Nevertheless in some provinces of Russia, if we may trust the records, these tendencies were reversed by the unwonted prosperity of the peasants. Furthermore, despite the wholesale slaughter of Russian troops reported in battle bulletins, the czar's armies seem to have lost fewer men in proportion to the number mobilized than did those of either France or Germany. In this respect France was the worst sufferer of the three.

An appendix to the French work, estimating the sum total of private incomes in that country before and after the war, indicates that, allowing for the changing value of money, their aggregate increased between 1913 and 1928. Simultaneously the ratio of large incomes to small and medium incomes declined. More elaborate calculations of the movement of wages, middle class incomes, and standards of living during the war itself occupy the second and last thirds of the German volume. These have rather special interest for the war historian, and also afford an excellent starting point for research into contemporary social trends in Germany. A concluding section of the Russian survey, containing a study of the social cost of the war by Baron Meyendorff, of the University of London, analyzes within brief compass the economic and psychological currents that carried the nation towards revolution. This is a readable and suggestive presentation of facts and interpretations that should not be neglected by students of Russia's great transition.

Austria's industries during the war form the topic of a book that has something of the style and set-up of a competent official report. It deals exhaustively with the organization, vicissitudes, and accomplishments of the country's major manufactures during that critical period, and is to be recommended for reference rather than for casual entertainment. The last of these five volumes, upon Great Britain's war taxes, by Sir Josiah Stamp, will have more than historical interest for the publicist and financial specialist, and contains hints worthy of current consideration in America. Although it deals mainly by example with the theory and administrative technique of national finance, it might well be embraced within the collateral reading of candidates for a political science degree. The English handle their taxes, and write about them, very well indeed.

The Library of Congress. VICTOR S. CLARK.

Contemporary Roumania and her Problems: a Study in Modern Nationalism. By Joseph S. Rouček, Ph.D., Professor of Social Science, Centenary

Junior College. (Stanford University, Stanford University Press, 1932, pp. xxv, 422, $4.00.) Observers of the Balkan scene will be interested in Professor Rouček's volume dealing with Roumania's recent history. The author traces briefly the political and economic history of the country from ancient Dacia to the present. His work is divided into four major parts: Historical development to 1914; Post-war political life; Constitutional and Administrative system; Economic Roumania. Part V. makes up the conclusion. There are interesting chapters on Roumania's internal development, her post-war foreign policy, and the problem of the miniorities.

Dr. Rouček's volume is well furnished with illustrations and statistical tables which enhance the value of his history. There is an excellent bibliography of works dealing with Roumanian history.

Miami University. HARRY N. HOWARD.

Nationalism and Education in Modern China. By Cyrus H. Peake, Lecturer in Chinese in Columbia University. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. xiv, 240, $3.00.) This excellent study includes, first of all, a brief history of the changes in education in China from 1860 to the present time. Within less than a hundred pages the author has compressed in clear and readable form a vast amount of information concerning the most far-reaching revolution in educational organization and content that the Chinese have ever known. We have often had summaries of this movement, but no short one of which the reviewer is aware surpasses this one for comprehensiveness and sense of proportion. The second part of the book is a treatment of the training in nationalism given by the textbooks of the modern Chinese government schools. It includes a summary of the chief tendencies and shows, as might be expected, a deliberate use by educators of curricula and textbooks to arouse in students a nationalistic spirit. The appendix contains descriptions and condensations of the pertinent material in forty-eight of the frequently used texts. The book preserves an admirable objectivity and is buttressed with extensive footnote references to the literature in both Chinese and Western languages.

Yale University. K. S. LATOURETTE.

Disarmament and Security since Locarno, 1925–1931: being the Political and Technical Background of the General Disarmament Conference, 1932. By John W. Wheeler-Bennett. With an Introduction by Major-General Sir Neill Malcolm, K.C.B., D.S.O. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. 383, $4.00.) The author has given the historical background to the Disarmament Conference treating in detail the whole movement since 1925. He reveals the experience of the League commissions that disarmament and security cannot be treated separately. Provisions of security, such as the Soviet system of neutrality and non-aggression, designed to localize military action

and avoid entanglements in a general conflict, in direct contrast to the French demand for general guarantees of security, are portrayed. In a final chapter there is set forth a series of events all tending toward the aggravation rather than the amelioration of the European situation. The main impression left by Mr. Wheeler-Bennett's book is that every attempt at international understanding is blocked by national rivalries. Security in last analysis depends on a spirit of confidence which is only made possible by international agreement. Mr. Wheeler-Bennett concludes his long account of disarmament efforts with the question: "Can the nations of the world renounce war with their minds as well as with their lips and pens, subconsciously as well as consciously?"

It should be noted that the book is not entirely a new work since about two hundred pages have been reprinted from the *Bulletin of International News* and from Mr. Latimer's book, *Naval Disarmament*. It is to be regretted that more references are not made to League of Nations documents rather than to former works of the author and to secondary material, yet the historical research student will find the book valuable.

American University. WILLIAM E. ARMSTRONG.

Pedro de Alvarado, Conquistador. By John Eoghan Kelly. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1932, pp. viii, 279, $3.50.) This work is an attempt to present a complete biography of Pedro de Alvarado, whose interesting career in Mexico and Guatemala was unsurpassed by few of the conquistadores. The account of the brave, daring, impetuous, and ambitious first lieutenant of Hernán Cortés will appeal strongly to the imagination of many readers.

The first part of the work treats the period of preparation when Alvarado took part in the conquest of Mexico. The story is largely that of Hernán Cortés, interspersed by the exploits of Alvarado, as depicted by Prescott and Bernal Díaz del Castillo. The author maintains that the conquerors were not unnecessarily bloodthirsty but, when acts of cruelty were committed, it was because odds were against them. There is practically nothing new in this part of the narration, nevertheless the material is condensed, presented in a better style than by most writers on the conquest of Mexico, and the attention of the reader is held until the end.

In the second part, Alvarado, who was trying to plant the outposts of empire for Charles V. in Central and South America, emerges as a conqueror in his own right. This is by far the best part of the book, since Alvarado is the principal actor and the author makes some contribution as he had access to material in Central America unknown to earlier writers. In the appendix a translation is given of some of the most important material. Two long letters of Alvarado to Cortés are translated in the text; it would be better if they were also in the appendix.

The author still believes in the jumping abilities of Alvarado, for, during the Spanish retreat from the Aztec capital, he says that Alvarado seized a pike, planted it in a piece of wreckage in the water, and jumped across the canal to safety (p. 91). In the *Proceso de Residencia* Alvarado stated very clearly how he got across the canal on that memorable night: "They [the enemies] wounded me badly and killed my horse. . . .It was a miracle that I could escape, and I could not have done it had it not been for a horseman, who was in another part; it was Cristobal Martin de Gamboa who took me on the haunches of his horse and brought me across" (J. F. Ramirez, *Proceso de Residencia,* p. 68; also see G. Werner's doctoral thesis on Pedro de Alvarado, University of California, 1923).

Alvarado has waited long, but he has now been presented in a judicious, interesting, and scholarly biography.

Oklahoma College for Women. LILLIAN ESTELLE FISHER.

William Penn, Quaker and Pioneer. By Bonamy Dobrée. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932, pp. vi, 346, $4.00.) Bonamy Dobrée, the British author of *Lord Chesterfield* and *John Wesley,* has presented in his *William Penn, Quaker and Pioneer,* not only a picturesque biography of the Quaker leader and founder of Pennsylvania but also a vivid portrayal of English and colonial life during the last half of the sixteenth century and the first two decades of the seventeenth. Appearing, as it does, on the occasion of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the landing of William Penn in America, this volume is especially timely. The materials contained in it supplement those found in M. R. Brailsford's *The Making of William Penn* (1930), which deals largely with Penn's life and work prior to the founding of Pennsylvania, and in Arthur Pound's *The Penns of Pennsylvania and England* (1932), which is concerned not alone with William Penn but with other members of his family as well. The volume is written in a pleasing style, the organization is excellent, and the character of the data used indicates that the author has consulted with more or less care most of the secondary materials on his subject and has delved somewhat into the sources. Unlike many biographers of William Penn, Mr. Dobrée foregoes extreme eulogy and is mildly critical. Admitting that Penn was "undoubtedly a man of stature", that he "accomplished great things", and that he "was a good man", he states frankly that he was not always "a wise man". "With the roughness smoothed, the idiosyncracies placidly accepted, the errors glozed over", he declares in his preface, Penn "becomes less interesting, less lovable, and in the end less great." At the same time, however, Mr. Dobrée by no means neglects the constructive and wholesome aspects of his life. Although the book contains comparatively little information new to the scholar, the author has compressed into a single volume an interesting and well-rounded record

of the life and achievements of the founder of Pennsylvania, selected and arranged for the general reader rather than for the special student of American colonial history.

Pennsylvania State College. ASA E. MARTIN.

The Letters of Eleazar Wheelock's Indians. Edited from the Originals by James Dow McCallum, Professor of English, Dartmouth College. [Dartmouth College Manuscript Series, no. 1.] (Hanover, Dartmouth College Publications, 1932, pp. 327, $4.00.) Eleazar Wheelock's "grand design" for the conversion of the Indians has been known chiefly through the narratives which he caused to be published between 1763 and 1775. In this handsome volume we may now read in the words of his Indian pupils themselves—and in Wheelock's occasional letters of admonition and counsel—some of the successes and not a few of the pitiful failures of his plan for training up Indian missionaries and teachers to lead their brethren out of heathen darkness. It is the first of a new Dartmouth College Manuscript series. Other promised volumes will contain more of Wheelock's letters, and also the life and letters of Samson Occom, and of John Ledyard, missionary diaries, and the diaries of early Dartmouth students and residents of Hanover.

Most of the letters here printed are from students trained by Wheelock at Lebanon, Connecticut, between 1754 and his removal to the New Hampshire wilderness in 1770. They are very human documents, indeed, in their simple piety, but disconcerting in the evidence they furnish that few of Wheelock's hopeful band ever quite assimilated that compound of Puritan theology and ethics with a smattering of classics which was imparted at Moor's Charity School. Few lived as blamelessly as young Joseph Woolley, the schoolmaster of Onohoquaga, who triumphed over "Carnal effections" to fall a victim of tuberculosis, and was mourned by an Iroquois council as "a very Sober Man, a very good Teacher". Most had sometime to confess to sins of drunkenness and backsliding, to rebellion against work and discipline. The record is one of Indian maladjustment to the white man's way of life and, inevitably, of failure in the main purpose of the scheme.

The arrangement of the letters under the names of the authors somewhat obscures their historical as against their personal interest, though place is found for such topics as News of the School, The Brothertown Settlement, etc. An introduction by the editor, Professor McCallum, provides a sufficiently full account of the origin and transformation of Wheelock's plan, of his relations with his financial backers, his conflicts with the S. P. G. and with Sir William Johnson, and the withdrawal of the Iroquois pupils. The appendixes include a list of all known Indian students in the school between 1754 and 1779, notes on missionary societies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and a bibliography.

The University of Michigan. V. W. CRANE.

Archives of Maryland. Volume XLVIII., subseries 8, *Journal and Correspondence of the State Council of Maryland, 1781–1784.* Volume XLIX., subseries 4, *Proceedings of the Provincial Court of Maryland, 1663–1666.* Edited by J. Hall Pleasants. [Published by Authority of the State under the Direction of the Maryland Historical Society.] (Baltimore, Maryland Historical Society, 1931, 1932, pp. xii, 581; xxxi, 610.) As in the case of its predecessor in the series (see this journal for October, 1931, p. 169) the materials in volume XLVIII. relate to the manifold activities of the state in the performance of its part in the conduct of the war and in the adjustments necessitated by the aftermath of the war. It is particularly significant that the materials for the year November, 1783, to November, 1784, amount to only about one-tenth of the whole. To such an extent did the cessation of the war reduce the activities of the state. Moreover, the states were to a degree losing interest in the union, with a consequent limitation of their activities in great measure to matters of internal concern.

Bulking large among the proceedings of the council are orders on the treasury for payments to individuals for services and supplies, with careful specification of the kind of money to be used; for there were the old Continental (although by this time about as dead as money could die), the new Continental (not much of which had come into circulation), the state issues (the "red" and the "black"), and finally there was, occasionally at least, "hard money" of various kinds. The problem of keeping the state's delegates in Congress supplied with funds sufficient even for the bare necessities of living, taxed the ingenuity of both the council and the delegates.

An especially valuable feature of the volume on the Provincial Court is the editorial exposition of the intricate history of the early courts of Maryland. The proceedings themselves bring into strong light the color and texture of the life of the time. Petty lawsuits were so numerous as to lead the editor to marvel that so small a population could indulge in so much litigation. Debts, naturally, furnish the basis for a large proportion of the cases, and imprisonment for debt was a common occurrence. There are even a considerable number of admiralty cases among these records.

Division of Historical Research,
Carnegie Institution of Washington.
EDMUND C. BURNETT.

The Ratification of the Federal Constitution in North Carolina. By Louise Irby Trenholme, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in the University of Missouri. [Studies in History, Economics and Public Law edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, no. 363.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. 282, $4.25.) In this volume Mrs. Trenholme gives a complete study of the politics of ratification in North Carolina. The most important feature of the book is the discussion of the various interests involved in ratification. She shows that the real ob-

jection to the constitution came from western agrarian groups in opposition to eastern commercial interests. Race was a minor factor in determining the attitude of the state, but religious differences constituted a more important line of cleavage, western Baptists and Presbyterians opposing union, while eastern Episcopalians favored it. Yet, as Mrs. Trenholme says, it was primarily the sectional rather than the denominational interest which conditioned their attitude. The economic status of the delegates to the first convention likewise was of slight importance. In general the federalists were of the wealthy classes, but antifederalists held extensive land grants in the west and many were large slaveholders. In summary she says that the decentralization of an agricultural state and the ignorance of national affairs, resulting in local sensitiveness, prevented ratification. The change in the second state convention she explains by the economic pressure of the first Congress of the United States in the form of tariff and navigation laws, which convinced the antifederalists of the interdependence of agricultural and commercial interests, the need for protection from a strong central government against the Indians, Federalist propaganda, and the proposal of amendments by Congress, which resolved some of the antifederalists' doubts.

It is a sober, straightforward, and well organized treatment, giving evidence of much painstaking and intelligent work. The proofreading is unusually well done, and the index is good, further proof of conscientious effort.

Agnes Scott College. PHILIP DAVIDSON.

George Morgan, Colony Builder. By Max Savelle, Assistant Professor of History, Stanford University. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. xiv, 266, $3.25.) The author of this excellent monograph avows as his purpose the telling of Morgan's life in such a way as to illustrate various important aspects of that period dealing with the "emergence of the United States from its colonial childhood into the maturity achieved with the establishment of the Constitution". This aim has been largely accomplished. Mr. Savelle has produced an interesting narrative about a little-known person who deserves wider fame.

Born in Philadelphia in 1743, of Welsh and English stock, George Morgan was sent by a mercantile firm, in 1765, to the Illinois country to exploit the Indian trade. He became eventually one of the promoters of the "Indiana Company" whose claims against Virginia made it, with Chisholm *v.* Georgia, a factor in evoking the eleventh amendment. After some service in the Revolution, lured by the "vision of empire", he established, under grant from Spain, the city of New Madrid, Missouri, in 1789. (This chapter appeared in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* for June, 1932.) Morgan's great-grandson, a Confederate midshipman, burned New Madrid in 1862. Colonel Morgan removed to Morganza in Washington County, Pennsylvania. Here he was visited by Aaron Burr, in 1806, as a result of which Morgan sent

Jefferson the first news the President received of Burr's probable nefarious plans. Morgan died in 1810.

This book is based largely upon manuscript sources, and is the result of careful research, here and abroad. Only one serious error appears. On page 131 Guy Johnson is named as the *son* of Sir William, instead of his *son-in-law*, and the impression is given a hasty reader that Guy strove to keep the Iroquois neutral. Actually he did his utmost to carry the entire Six Nations into the British camp. Only the influence of Samuel Kirkland prevented this.

Hamilton College. MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR.

General William Eaton: the Failure of an Idea. By Francis Rennell Rodd. (New York, Minton, Balch and Company, 1932, pp. xi, 314, $3.50.) An Englishman has in this very readable and well illustrated biography attempted to obtain fuller recognition for a once prominent but now virtually forgotten American. Mr. Rodd has not, he frankly admits, been greatly interested in the first thirty-three years of Eaton's career, and has allotted to them only twenty-one pages. This brief treatment of Eaton's earlier activities and immediate environment is rather surprising in view of the fact that during this period Eaton obtained his formal schooling, served as a soldier in the American Revolution, fought Indians in Ohio under "Mad Anthony" Wayne, and, as an army captain in Georgia, obtained a large amount of experience regarding Creek Indians and Yazoo land companies.

Eaton, of course, performed his greatest work in Africa. While representing the United States in a diplomatic as well as consular capacity at Tunis, he for years courageously and ably protected American interests along the Barbary coast. It was in 1801 that he became the leading exponent of the idea to the history of which the greater portion of Mr. Rodd's book is devoted. That idea, briefly, was that the United States could obtain an early and permanent peace with Tripoli by aiding Hamet Karamanli, exiled brother of Yusuf Karamanli, the reigning pasha, to overthrow and to succeed the latter.

The plan failed through no fault of Eaton's. For years he sought to secure its adoption at Washington, and when partially successful there, he displayed great resourcefulness in attempting to execute it. In the face of almost insuperable obstacles he ultimately recruited a small army in Egypt, marched it across the Libyan desert, and, in 1805, seized the Tripolitan town of Derne. But his hopes were soon dashed by Lear's precipitate treaty. Eaton's later years, deeply marred by this incident, are passed over briefly in this book.

Mr. Rodd's personal observations regarding the region through which Eaton marched in invading Tripoli constitute a useful supplement to what has previously been written about this fascinating African campaign. The author has, however, failed to use certain sources which are indispensable to a thoroughly exhaustive study of even that portion of Eaton's career upon

which he has concentrated his main effort. Most noteworthy of these sources is the splendid collection of manuscript material relative to Eaton in the Department of State. The biography contains some confusing inconsistencies in the spelling of titles or names of certain individuals. James (not "John") Leander Cathcart was the person from whom Eaton acquired the "idea" that failed.

New York University. RAY W. IRWIN.

Jason Lee, Prophet of the New Oregon. By Cornelius J. Brosnan, Professor of American History, University of Idaho. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. x, 348, $3.00.) This book possesses real merit as a piece of careful research, producing for the first time a thoroughly documented story of the Oregon Mission as headed by Jason Lee. The author has uncovered hitherto unknown sources of real value, as in the Fisk-Lee correspondence, and he has exploited the known sources with praiseworthy assiduity. His work, on the factual side, may be accepted as definitive, though he could have profited in some minor particulars from Merk's *Fur Trade and Empire* had that work been available to him.

On the side of the critical evaluation of his sources and the interpretation of history through them one is compelled to make certain reservations. A careful reading of the evidence accumulated in this work will prove that Lee's mind, from first to last, was foggy with reference to his objectives. He could assert roundly: "The exclusive object of the mission is the benefit of the Indian tribes west of the Rocky Mountains" and in the same paragraph justify a colonizing enterprise because it would make possible the necessary "extensive manual labor schools for Indian children and youth". He could, in the same connection, insist as a first condition, upon a government guarantee that "the land we take up, and the improvements we make upon it shall be secured to us". In another connection he could declare to the Methodist Missionary Board "that the growth and spread, and rise, and glory and triumph of Methodism in the Walamette Valley is destined to be commensurate with the growth and rise and prosperity of our now infant, but flourishing and rapidly increasing settlement. . .".

Mr. Brosnan has demonstrated Lee's superiority, almost genius, as a missionary agitator and financial agent; but he has failed to prove him other than a somewhat confused opportunist in his planning and administration, or that the board was wrong in supplanting him after he had expended $120,000 with little more to show for it than some valuable land claims bound to be a community grievance as soon as the American settlers became strong enough to challenge the missionary forces.

A few errors have eluded the author's vigilance, but on the whole the book is well done. And notwithstanding its plethora of quoted matter, or possibly because of it, it reads interestingly.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin. JOSEPH SCHAFER.

A Frontier Lady: Recollections of the Gold Rush and Early California. By Sarah Royce. With a Foreword by Katherine Royce. Edited by Ralph Henry Gabriel, Professor of History in Yale University. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932, pp. xiv, 144, $2.00.) We have been told that the leveling force of the old frontier was indiscriminate in its application. Peoples and creeds and customs and habits all were invariably modified by its influence. "In short", said the late Professor F. J. Turner, "at the frontier the environment is at first too strong for the man." But it did not affect Sarah Eleanor Royce and her brand of Puritanism. To the end she remained a Frontier Lady, and desperate situations and shocking, immoral conditions merely deepened her faith and strengthened her resistance. She brought civilization into the midst of a frontier environment and as long as she remained, that environment gave way. The Puritanism which she represented was too strong for the savage conditions of even a mining frontier. Indeed the first point of interest which this little volume contributes to the literature of Western history is the challenge it gives to the old thesis on the influence of the frontier. The second is the straightforward narrative itself which grips the attention of the reader—a narrative relating the experiences and reactions of a cultivated woman while crossing the plains in an ox-drawn wagon, while living in a frontier mining camp in California, and finally while seeking habitable accommodations in San Francisco during the hectic days of the early fifties.

Mills College. CARDINAL GOODWIN.

Joe Bailey, the Last Democrat. By Sam Hanna Acheson. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. xvi, 420, $2.50.) This book will command the attention of most people who remember the career of Joe Bailey, for it is well written and is abundantly documented. Whether the ghost of Bailey would approve a picture that is not attractive is problematical, but probably it would, for the original was honest and must have known that no artist could make him attractive. This is not denying that he did "attract" men to him, but the picture of the man's life is not one of which the country can be proud.

What are some elements of his record? Early in life Bailey reached the conclusion that the railroads should be brought under control and he deserves credit for his share in shaping and passing the Elkins Act of 1906. He opposed the "Cleveland heresy" of free raw materials (which did not originate with Cleveland), and fought for an income tax. He was an anti-imperialist when Texas was calling for annexation. On the other hand he initiated Bryan into free silver, which was a great "heresy", and fought him most of the time on other issues, such as the initiative and referendum, prohibition, and votes for women. He helped materially to bring on a useless war with Spain. Because he failed to get a political friend appointed to office, he thereafter de-

nounced Cleveland and declared that the civil service was a "colossal humbug". He opposed legislation in Texas to protect farm tenants and laborers, yet supported "Ma" Ferguson.

Few men have occupied the front of the political stage as prominently as he did and yet left as little impress upon history. In another ten years his record could be blotted out and historians would hardly know the difference. When he died the chief things that the newspapers found to say about him were that, while a man of political courage and marvelous personality, he was to be remembered for his strong arguments reënforced by his fists, his denunciation of Woodrow Wilson as a "socialist", and his own connection with the oil scandals.

The reviewer has noticed few errors and omissions. In a biography one expects to find when the subject was born and when he died. By implication the reader will infer that Joe Bailey was born on October 3, 1863, but only the year of his death is given. Self-control is something which Bailey often lacked and one would like to know just how he behaved when he spoke with "deadly self-control".

The University of Arkansas. DAVID Y. THOMAS.

American Foreign Policy in Mexican Relations. By James Morton Callahan. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1932, pp. x, 644, $4.00.) Professor Callahan has crowned a long career of investigation into the foreign relations of the United States by this first comprehensive work on the relations between the United States and Mexico from 1824 to 1931. In spite of certain habits of style which make the book hard reading, it will perform a useful service as an encyclopædia of United States-Mexican relations. For the period before 1907 his researches are based upon the manuscript archives of the Department of State; from 1907 to 1920 he relied principally upon the published volumes of *Foreign Relations;* and since 1920 upon government reports, congressional documents, and newspapers.

The scope of the work is best indicated by a summary of the chapter contents: early American interests in Latin America, and the policy of recognition; Poinsett's mission; Texas and the claims negotiations under Jackson and Van Buren; Tyler and Texas; Polk and California; Tehuantepec transit negotiations of 1848–1853; the Gadsden Purchase; Buchanan's policy; Seward's policy—the Maximillian incident; border depredations of the seventies and eighties; the recognition of Díaz; the invasion of Mexico by American capital during the Díaz régime—railroads, agricultural colonies, mining and smelting; manufacturing; cattle, and oil; the Wilson-Bryan diplomacy; and the last decade of adjustment—chiefly the work of Dwight W. Morrow.

The treatment intends to be objective to the point of colorlessness. Professor Callahan has a sympathetic appreciation of the difficulties that have always

beset Mexican diplomacy, especially with the United States (p. vi). Sometimes one suspects that he does not quite approve the policy of a particular administration—even that of President Wilson. But he contents himself with analyzing the documents and letting the facts which they allege speak for themselves. Here, perhaps, he is from the weight of his sources slightly less than fair, for he is much more familiar with the case of the United States, which is usually the plaintiff, than he is with that of Mexico, the defendant. But one cannot doubt the conscientious effort to present the Mexican point of view.

The book seems to this reviewer to be an important contribution to its subject. While many monographs have been written on phases of Mexican-United States relations and many others will be written—some suggested and facilitated by this book—as a survey of the whole field it is not likely soon to have a rival.

The University of Texas. EUGENE C. BARKER.

The Cuban Situation and Our Treaty Relations. By Philip G. Wright. (Washington, D. C., Brookings Institution, 1931, pp. xiv, 207, $2.50.) This volume deals with the effect that Cuba's treaties with the United States have had on its economic development. The growth of the island's fundamental industry, sugar culture, is explained as primarily due to three factors: the influx of American capital following the adoption of the Permanent Treaty; the benefits derived from the reciprocity treaty of 1903; and the war, which in dislocating the world's sugar trade, created a strong demand for Cuba's product. In estimating the past and present influence of the two treaties the author has made an important contribution, convincingly proving that the reciprocity agreement was at first distinctly valuable but has, with the elmination of Cuba's foreign competitors from the American market, become little more than a nominal concession, neither beneficial nor harmful.

The effect of the Permanent Treaty, embodying the articles of the Platt Amendment, has also been considerable but less direct. The willingness of American capital to enter Cuba is attributed largely to the high degree of political stability which the treaty assured. Concerning the propriety of continuing it in force in the face of the opposition it arouses, the author is noncommittal. He concludes, however, that the ultimate solution of Cuba's economic problems depends not upon the maintenance or abrogation of its treaties with the United States, but upon an improvement in the price of sugar or a diversification of industry. Given the views on tariff that prevail today, the latter development would probably serve the island and its people best.

The study is a careful and timely appraisal of an extremely delicate situation. It is presented in a clear and concise manner and supported by intelligible charts and statistics. Unfortunately its value to the student of interna-

tional relations and international economic policies has been lessened by the failure to include either adequate footnotes or a bibliography.

New York University. LEO J. MEYER.

America in the Pacific: a Century of Expansion. By Foster Rhea Dulles. (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1932, pp. xiii, 299, $3.50.) In this timely volume the author of recent books on *The Old China Trade* and *Eastward Ho!* traces the successive steps by which the United States established its position in the Pacific, and presents the development of interests which have determined America's present responsibility and influential policy there. It was the early Yankee trade with China which first awakened American ambitions; this trade, also, the author believes, by the necessity for ports and harbors, was the basis and origin of the earliest American claims to territory on the Northwest coast. After the triumph of the continental expansion in 1848, the course of empire still pointed westward, and, though in the face of a strong minority opposition, the prophecy of manifest destiny was later consummated. Opportunities, at first rejected or neglected, were later accepted by a decision often of a single leader who occupied a strategic position and who threw his personal influence into the balance.

An introductory chapter on Westward Lies the Course of Empire is followed by four general chapters (Cape Horn Around, The Overland Trail, Manifest Destiny, and Perry's Forecasts); these are followed by nine chapters relating to the various acquisitions—Alaska, Samoa, Hawaii, and the Philippines. The acquisition of the Philippines, the author says, was basically for trade and empire, and "perhaps inevitable". He regards it as a new departure in American policy of self-government and democracy—a departure which McKinley accepted "only after long communion with God"—and he expects America to return to early tradition by granting independence to the Philippines in accord with a policy of division of power in the Pacific based upon a program of international coöperation. He asserts that the United States made a tragic mistake in 1898–1899 in its refusal to give the Filipinos any definite pledge of eventual independence. Referring to recent Japanese policy, the author declares that after the international accords of 1921–1922 the American government could not recognize special Japanese rights in Manchuria which might be claimed because of territorial propinquity.

Mr. Dulles treats in succinct but interesting style the forces and influences behind each successive wave of expansion, and the diplomatic negotiations by which each was accomplished. He presents a well organized, readable treatment of striking phases of American history. It is equipped with bibliographical references to documents and secondary sources, but the basic materials do not include manuscript sources. The index is brief but satisfactory.

West Virginia University. JAMES MORTON CALLAHAN.

The Founding of Churchill, being the Journal of Captain James Knight, Governor-in-Chief in Hudson Bay, from the 14th of July to the 13th of September, 1717. Edited, with a Historical Introduction and Notes, by James F. Kenney, M. A., Ph. D., F. R. Hist. S., Director of Historical Research and Publicity in the Public Archives of Canada. (Toronto, J. M. Dent and Sons, 1932, pp. x, 213, $2.50.) In 1929, the Hudson Bay Railway reached Churchill, and once again, the mouth of the Churchill River had become "the gateway to the harvest of the West". The present volume is concerned with the founding of Churchill in 1717, by Captain James Knight, who had been governor for the Hudson's Bay Company "in ye bottome of the Bay" since 1692. Knight too was concerned with finding a gateway to the West. The harvest he sought was not, however, golden grain, but the "Yellow Mettle", which eventually lured him to his death amid the snows of Canada. One-half of this little volume is devoted to an historical introduction, which deals with early voyages to find the Northwest passage, rivalries between French and English over the trading stations on Hudson Bay, and the career of Captain Knight, both before and after 1717. One chapter summarizes briefly the later history of Churchill to the present day.

The journal itself covers seventy-eight pages. It is the latter part of Knight's York Fort Journal for 1716–1717, and the present text is from a transcript made in 1912 for the Public Archives of Canada from the original, preserved in the archives of Hudson's Bay House, London. The printed sources for the early history of Hudson Bay are comparatively few and this little volume will be welcomed as a valuable addition to J. B. Tyrell's edition of *Documents relating to the Early History of Hudson Bay,* issued by the Champlain Society in Toronto in 1931. The introduction to the latter volume contains quotations from Knight's journal, but without indicating where omissions were made by the editor. Although both editors used the same transcript, apparently each followed his own judgment in reproducing the erratic and misleading capitalization and punctuation of the original.

Dr. Kenney has done a careful job of editing and annotating. The journal probably has more antiquarian interest than historical value, but it does give something of a picture of life in the Canadian North—the ceaseless efforts to secure peace and trade with the Indians, the encounter with Eskimo bands, "Musketos" and swarms of sand flies, the lack of medicines, the dependence of the post on supply ships from home, the bitter cold, the loneliness, fears, and hazardous toil of men, often "very much putt to it for Victualls", who were trying to erect an outpost for English trade on the barren shores of Hudson Bay. The index is well done, and the bibliographical note of eight pages is one of the most valuable features of the book.

The Ohio State University. Carl Wittke.

COMMUNICATION

To the EDITOR of the *American Historical Review:*

The January, 1933, issue of the *Review* contains Professor Schlesinger's review of the ninth volume of the *Dictionary of American Biography* in which he makes some pointed remarks regarding my treatment of Andrew Jackson. Of his disagreement with my interpretation of Jackson, which he frankly admits is the primary reason for his opinion that the article "falls short of the average", I do not complain; but when he charges that errors have been made in the statement of certain very elementary facts, and then enumerates instances which are not matters of fact but matters of interpretation or construction, in justice to myself and the *Dictionary,* I have a right to object. My argument that Jackson's introduction of the spoils system and his Maysville Road veto were based upon motives of policy rather than of principle does discount many of Jackson's own statements in regard to those matters. My reasons for these views have been published at length, and my contention is specifically that it is sometimes necessary to look beyond the words of politicians, past or present (T. P. Abernethy, *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee,* ch. XV.). To say that the Bank of the United States was dead when Jackson had struck its death-blow is a figure of speech. To say that the Battle of New Orleans made Jackson President is likewise figurative, but the meaning is hardly to be misconstrued in either case. Finally, Professor Schlesinger says: "And what would Calhoun, then coöperating with the Whigs, have said to the author's contention that that chaotic party was committed to 'Clay's nationalist policy'?" Despite the jockeying of leaders in Congress, the opposition party in the north and central South was made up preponderantly of nationalists (A. C. Cole, *The Whig Party in the South,* p. 45; T. P. Abernethy, "The Origin of the Whig Party in Tennessee", *Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* XII. 510–511).

The University of Virginia, February 1, 1933. T. P. ABERNETHY.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The following are the principal items from the Treasurer's Report (Dec. 1, 1931-Nov. 30, 1932), presented at Toronto.

Receipts and Expenditures, balanced at		$143,046.37
Receipts:		
Annual dues		11,793.28
Contributions		894.00
Interest		13,288.00
On Unrestricted Funds	$6,747.01	
Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund	4,204.25	
Littleton-Griswold Fund	1,250.00	
Special Grants:		
Carnegie Corporation of New York, Commission on Social Studies		72,000.00
Rockefeller Foundation, for International Committee of Historical Sciences		8,000.00
American Council of Learned Societies:		
Bibliography of Travel		1,500.00
Conference on Problems of Graduate Study and Research		200.00
Social Science Research Committee, Committee on Research Planning		1,250.00
Expenditures, chief items:		
Secretary and Treasurer		6,809.68
Committees of Management (Council, etc.)		1,523.58
Historical Activities (Commissions, Revolving Fund, etc.)		8,991.48
Commission on Social Studies		77,375.52
International Committee of Historical Sciences		8,000.00
Bibliography of Travel		2,147.95
Committee on Research Planning		1,534.14
American Historical Review (Copies to members)		8,538.17
(Editorial expenses)		4,540.00
Cash on deposit		10,013.05

The Budget for Fiscal Period December 1, 1932-November 30, 1933.

Receipts: Available for General Purposes:	
Annual dues	$ 10,500.00
Registration fees	300.00
Interest on unrestricted funds	5,250.00
Publications	1,700.00
Balance on hand, Dec. 1, 1932	1,213.71
	$ 18,963.71

Expenditures for General Purposes:	
Washington Office, rent, salaries, supplies, etc	$ 4,990.00
Contingent fund	600.00
Editorial service, *Annual Report*	700.00
Council	600.00
Annual Meeting	675.00
Pacific Coast Branch	450.00
Contribution to international Committee of Historical Sciences	100.00
Total	$ 8,115.00
For Historical Activities	
Historical Manuscripts Commission	$ 100.00
Public Archives Commission	400.00
Conference of Historical Societies	25.00
Writings on American History	500.00
Dues in American Council of Learned Societies	75.00
Bibliography of Travel	500.00
International Bibliography	200.00
Total	$ 1,800.00
For *American Historical Review*	
Appropriation representing Net Cost to the Association of the *Review*, including copies supplied to Members	$ 8,200.00
Grand Total	$ 18,115.00

The Officers and Committees of the American Historical Association for the year 1933 are:

President, Charles A. Beard, New Milford, Conn.

First Vice President, William E. Dodd, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Second Vice President, Michael I. Rostovtzeff, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Executive Secretary, Conyers Read, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Secretary, Dexter Perkins, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.

Treasurer, Constantine, E. McGuire, 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C.

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Patty W. Washington, 40 B street, S. W., Washington, D. C.

Editor of the Annual Report, Lowell Joseph Ragatz, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Council (*ex officio*) the president, vice presidents, secretary, and treasurer; (elected members) Dixon Ryan Fox, Ulrich B. Phillips, Charles W. Ramsdell, Christopher B. Coleman, Sidney B. Fay, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, John D. Hicks, Julian P. Bretz; (former presidents) J. Franklin Jameson, Albert Bushnell Hart, Andrew C. McLaughlin, George L. Burr, Worthington C. Ford, Charles H. Haskins, Edward P. Cheyney, Charles M. Andrews, Henry Osborn Taylor, James H. Breasted, James Harvey Robinson, Evarts B. Greene, Carl Becker, Herbert E. Bolton.

Executive Committee of the Council: William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman; Charles A. Beard, Sidney B. Fay, Dixon Ryan Fox; (*ex officio*) Dexter Perkins, Constantine E. McGuire.

Board of Trustees: Conyers Read, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman; Raymond N. Ball, Guy Emerson, Fairfax Harrison, Thomas I. Parkinson.

Officers of the Pacific Coast Branch: *President,* Charles E. Chapman, University of California; *Vice President,* William H. Ellison, Santa Barbara State College; *Secretary-Treasurer,* Carl F. Brand, Stanford University; *Executive Committee:* (the above) and Meribeth Cameron, Osgood Hardy, H. A. Hubbard, W. N. Sage; *Editors of the Pacific Historical Review:* Donald G. Barnes, Dan E. Clark, Cardinal Goodwin, George P. Hammond, Herbert I. Priestley, Payson J. Treat; John C. Parish, managing editor.

Committee on Program for the Forty-eighth Annual Meeting: W. S. Robertson, 806 Florida Avenue, Urbana, Ill., chairman; Conyers Read, 226 South 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pa., secretary; R. G. Caldwell, Dixon Ryan Fox, Albert Hyma, R. J. Kerner, Frederick Merk, R. A. Newhall, J. F. Rippy, Jonathan F. Scott, Caroline Ware, Allen B. West, Stanley Williams; and (*ex officio*) Charles A. Beard, Christopher B. Coleman, Dexter Perkins, Oscar C. Stine.

Committee on Local Arrangements for the Forty-eighth Annual Meeting: Albert J. Harno, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., chairman.

Committee on Nominations: John C. Parish, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif., chairman; Dumas Malone, Louise P. Kellogg, Arthur E. R. Boak, James P. Baxter, 3rd.

Board of Editors of American Historical Review: Henry E. Bourne (*ex officio* as Managing Editor), 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C.; Arthur C. Cole, Verner W. Crane, Tenney Frank, James Westfall Thompson, Charles Seymour, J. F. Rippy.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., chairman; Charles W. Ramsdell, L. W. Labaree, A. O. Craven, Edgar E. Robinson.

Public Archives Commission: A. R. Newsome, North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh, N. C., chairman; Victor H. Paltsits, Margaret C. Norton, Stewart Mitchell, E. E. Dale, Julian P. Boyd.

Committee on Bibliography of Modern British History: Edward P. Cheyney, R. F. D. No. 3, Media, Pa., chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Godfrey Davies, R. B. Merriman, Wallace Notestein, Conyers Read, Caroline F. Ware.

Committee on Publications: Leo F. Stock, 1017 Michigan Avenue, N. E., Washington, D. C., chairman; the Editor of the *Annual Report,* Managing Editor of the *Review,* and chairmen of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, the Public Archives Commission, and the committees on Bibliography of Modern British History, the Bibliography of Travel, the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications, the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund, and the Littleton-Griswold Fund.

Committee on Membership: Arthur J. May, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., chairman; E. C. Kirkland, J. E. Pomfret, Alan K. Manchester, F. L. Benns, Lawrence D. Steefel, Wendell H. Stephenson, Thomas A. Bailey, Reginald G. Trotter.

Conference of Historical Societies: Christopher B. Coleman, Historical Bureau, Indianapolis, Ind., secretary.

Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools: A. C. Krey, The Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., chairman; F. W. Ballou, Charles A. Beard, Isaiah Bowman, Ada L. Comstock, George S. Counts, Edmund E. Day, Guy Stanton Ford, C. J. H. Hayes, Ernest Horn, Henry Johnson, Leon C. Marshall, Charles E. Merriam, Jesse H. Newlon, W. T. Root, Jesse F. Steiner.

Delegates in the American Council of Learned Societies: Evarts B. Greene, Edward P. Cheyney.

Committee on the George Louis Beer Prize: R. C. Binkley, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, chairman; Theodore Collier, M. B. Giffen.

Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government: Samuel F. Bemis, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., chairman; W. K. Boyd, Dumas Malone, Charles Moore, Joseph Schafer, St. George L. Sioussat, Leo F. Stock, Mark Sullivan, Charles Warren.

Representatives in the International Committee of Historical Sciences: Waldo G. Leland, 703 Insurance Building, Washington, D. C., Monsignor George Lacombe, 1000 Fulton Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Representatives of the Subcommission of the International Committee of Historical Sciences on Colonial History: William R. Shepherd, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., Lowell Joseph Ragatz, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Committee on the Jusserand Medal: Merle E. Curti, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., chairman; Gilbert Chinard, F. Stringfellow Barr.

Committee on the John H. Dunning Prize: James G. Randall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., chairman; E. M. Coulter, J. L. Sellers.

Delegates in the Social Science Research Council: Guy Stanton Ford, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Carl Wittke.

Representatives in the Committee for the Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences: C. J. H. Hayes, Carl Becker, C. H. Haring.

Committee on the Carnegie Revolving Fund for Publications: Edward P. Cheyney, R. F. D. No. 3, Media, Pa., chairman; Henry Commager, R. D. W. Connor, Howard L. Gray, Thomas J. Wertenbaker.

Committee on the Bibliography of Travel: Solon J. Buck, Historical Building, 4338 Bigelow Boulevard, Pittsburgh, Pa.

International Subcommittee on Chronology: Monsignor George Lacombe, 1000 Fulton Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Committee on the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund: Ulrich B. Phillips, chairman; Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., acting chairman; Arthur C. Cole.

Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund: Evarts B. Greene, 602 Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., chairman; Charles

M. Andrews, Carroll T. Bond, John Dickinson, Felix Frankfurter, Richard B. Morris.

Committee on Finance: Constantine E. McGuire, 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C., chairman; Mrs. Frank T. Griswold, Waldo G. Leland, Dexter Perkins, Conyers Read.

Committee on Radio: John A. Krout, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., chairman; Raymond L. Buell, R. D. W. Connor, William E. Dodd, Ralph H. Gabriel.

One of the recommendations of the Committee on the Planning of Research which the Council endorsed was the adoption by graduate schools of the requirement that two copies of unpublished doctoral dissertations be deposited in the library of the university granting the degree. This would make possible the loan of one copy to other libraries as occasion demanded. The Council asked Dr. Read, the executive secretary, to enlist the coöperation of all graduate schools to this end. Dr. Read has written a letter to the deans in which he remarks that the "regulation requiring the deposit of doctoral dissertations in the university library is fairly common, but in view of the fact that only one copy is ordinarily deposited the university librarian very properly declines to allow this copy to leave its shelves. The consequence is that unprinted doctoral dissertations are in a large measure virtually inaccessible and a great deal of scholarly work is to all intents and purposes buried as soon as it is completed." The executive secretary desires to know what graduate schools already make other requirements, especially if the requirement of printing exists, or what provisions exist for some distribution of the dissertations. The Association is, of course, primarily interested in dissertations in the field of history. As the Council desires to make a record of the practice of American graduate schools in this regard, the executive secretary desires to learn from the deans of the graduate schools any action taken with reference to the suggested requirement of deposit of dissertations, what arrangement is made for rendering these dissertations accessible to scholars, and, if publication of dissertations is required, whether this condition must be met before the degree is conferred, or, if not, within a definite period thereafter. Any other information bearing upon actual practice will be welcomed.

Another section of the *Annual Report* of the Association for 1929 has appeared: *Writings on American History,* compiled by Grace Gardner Griffin (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1933, pp. xxvi, 388, $1.00).

The American Council of Learned Societies

The annual meeting of the Council was held at Philadelphia on January 28 and 29. A tribute to the late Dana C. Munro, who had been chairman of the advisory board, presented by Mr. E. P. Cheyney, Mr. J. Franklin Jameson, and Mr. W. E. Lingelbach, was adopted as a resolution of the Council. A message of greeting was sent to Professor Charles H. Haskins, the first chair-

man of the Council. The treasurer reported that the expenditures for general purposes during the past year had been $161,122.52, and that a sum slightly larger was available for the current year. Among the projects of special interest to historical students, which it was decided to further, was the Linguistic Atlas: a Study of New England Speech. The Library of Congress Gift Fund was to receive a grant for the completion and publication of the Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts, and for the compilation of a Catalogue of Alchemical Manuscripts. The American Historical Association was to receive grants for the completion of a Bibliography of American Travel, a Bibliographical Guide to the Opinion-forming Press of the United States, and for the preparation of the annual volume of *Writings on American History*. To the Mediaeval Academy of America were voted grants for the completion of an edition of Servius, *Commentaries on Virgil,* and for editing selected texts of Averroes, *Commentaries on Aristotle*. In the field of Ancient history and archæology provision was made to assist the American School for Classical Studies in Athens in carrying forward the excavations at Corinth, and a grant was made through the University of Chicago to Professor R. J. Bonner and Professor Gertrude Smith for the expense of preparing volume II. of the *History of the Administration of Justice in Ancient Greece*. Goucher College was granted aid toward the expenses of volume II. of *Cuneiform Inscriptions,* by R. F. Dougherty. Certain projects carried on under the auspices of the Union Académique Internationale were also aided; dictionaries of Medieval, and British Medieval Latin, and an edition of the Beryer-Holloman collection relating to Customary Law in the Philippine Islands. In addition to these, grants were made for other projects in the fields of humanistic studies, as well as provision for graduate fellowships and grants-in-aid.

The Historical Congress at Warsaw

The preliminary program of the Sixth International Congress of the Historical Sciences has now been issued. It is an impressive document. A veritable galaxy of historians is to be present judging from the list of those who are to give papers in the various sections. These sections are as follows: Auxiliary Sciences, Archives, Organization of Historical Work; Prehistory and Archæology; Ancient History; the Middle Ages and Byzantium; Modern and Contemporary History; History of Religions and Ecclesiastical History; History of Law and Institutions; Economic and Social History; History of Science, Pure Science and Medicine; History of Letters; History of Art; Historical Method and Theory; Teaching of History and History of Eastern Europe. Besides these, six special sessions are devoted to Historical Geography, Nationalism, Demography, etc. The Americans who appear on this program are B. W. Bond, jr., Earl Cranston, Stephen D'Irsay, F. M. Fling, L. R. Gottschalk, C. L. Grose, C. J. H. Hayes, George Lacombe, W. G. Le-

land, L. J. Ragatz, Jacob Shatzky, and Solomon Zeitlin. The large number of French delegates—over eighty—may be in part explained as a compliment to an allied state. Included among them are many of the most distinguished historians of Paris and the provincial universities. Germany, however, is also well represented by such names as Brackmann, Brandenburg, Grabmann, Hoetzsch, and Kulischer. The Congress will be opened on Monday, August 21, and will last eight days, seven being spent in Warsaw and the eighth day in Cracow. Favorable rates have been obtained from the railroads and hotels. Sightseeing excursions are planned. The secretary general of the organizing committee is Professor Tadeusz Manteuffel, of the University of Warsaw. Americans who expect to attend the Congress may obtain further information at the office of Dr. W. G. Leland, Council of Learned Societies, 907 15th St., Washington, D. C.

PERSONAL

There are few men whose loss from the historical profession could have brought such a realization of deprivation and sense of regret as that produced by the sudden death of Professor Dana C. Munro. He died of pneumonia after but a few days illness in a hospital in New York on January 13, 1933. He had been up to the time of his illness in good health and full vigor, occupied with many scholarly and personal activities and plans. His life had been one of unusual balance between teaching, administrative, and literary work, and between travel and the quiet enjoyment of home surroundings.

Professor Munro was born on June 7, 1866, in Bristol, Rhode Island, where his family had lived for five generations. He graduated from Brown University in 1887 and received advanced degrees from that institution in 1890 and 1912. He studied for a short time in Germany and taught three years in high schools. During the years 1892 and 1893 he carried on post-graduate study at the University of Pennsylvania and in 1893 was appointed instructor and subsequently assistant professor of Medieval history there. From 1902 to 1915 he was professor of European history at the University of Wisconsin and from 1915 till his death he was professor of Medieval history at Princeton. He early became interested in the period of the Crusades and at various times made different aspects of that period the subject of his teaching courses, seminars, and public addresses. The Crusades were also the subject of his course of Lowell Institute Lectures. These he prepared for publication and they will probably appear at an early date. He planned to write an extended history of the Crusades and twice visited the Near East to obtain greater clearness of knowledge of the surroundings and conditions of those events.

In 1903 he published a volume of *Essays on the Crusades*. He also wrote several well-known textbooks in Ancient and Medieval history, among them *The Middle Ages* (1921), and translated and edited several numbers of the

University of Pennsylvania Translations and Reprints. Throughout his career he was a frequent contributor of book reviews to historical journals.

While in Philadelphia and engaged in his study of the Middle Ages he was invited by Henry C. Lea to make use of his library and so became intimate with the great Church historian, who repeatedly mentioned to the writer of this sketch his enjoyment of his conversations with Munro. On the other hand, his description of Mr. Lea's methods of work and reminiscences of their intercourse have been placed on record by him in various articles.

At Wisconsin he shared in the administrative work of the university, and was active in the State Historical Society and the Wisconsin Academy, and president of the latter from 1912 to 1915. During the World War he was research assistant to the Committee on Public Information and later chairman of the National Board of Historical Service. In this connection he prepared and issued two pamphlets, *German War Practices* and *German Treatment of Conquered Countries*. He was active in the affairs of the American Historical Association and was its president in 1925–1926. On this occasion his former students presented him with a volume of studies, most of which were in the field of Medieval history and all of which reflected his critical influence and scholarly ideals.

In 1928, when Professor Jameson felt it necessary to withdraw from the managing editorship of this journal and arrangements could not at the time be made to place it in charge of a permanent editor, Professor Munro agreed to take the editorship for a year and was in charge of the volume for the year 1928–1929. In the same year the recently formed Council of Learned Societies felt the need of preparatory study of the various projects brought before it for discussion and recommendation to the great foundations for subsidy or support, and set up an Advisory Board of which Professor Munro was made chairman and so remained till his death. His judicial temperament and his appreciation of the importance or recognition of the impracticability of the proposals that were being brought in constantly increasing numbers before the council made his advice and service in this position invaluable. He spent much time during his later years in reëditing Paetow's *Guide to the Study of Medieval History*. He became president of the Medieval Academy in 1930 and remained so till his death. He was active in the affairs of the American Philosophical Society. He was a fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

It is not yet known how near his large work on the Crusades is to completion. He was recognized as the most eminent authority in that field and the importance of the publication of a new and scholarly treatment of that whole subject has been long recognized. Many interruptions, his editorial and administrative work, and his high scholarly standards have prevented its more rapid progress. He was working upon it during the last few months of his life and was anticipating early opportunity for more continuous writing

when he should have retired from teaching, as he would have done at an early period. But it is for his influence as a teacher and guide of advanced students, for his ready appreciation and encouragement of other men's work, for his many services in the cause of scholarship and for his warm, kindly nature that Professor Munro will be especially remembered. A host of students and colleagues valued his friendship and will feel the world poorer for his loss.

E. P. C.

Charles Henry Smith, professor of American history in Yale University from 1890 to 1910, died on February 15 at the age of 90. Prior to his service at Yale he had been a member of the faculty of Bowdoin College for sixteen years.

Arthur Cushman McGiffert, distinguished Church historian, died on February 26 at the age of 71. After being graduated from Western Reserve College in 1882 and from Union Theological Seminary in 1885, he studied abroad, especially at the universities of Berlin and Marburg. He began his career as a teacher in Lane Seminary in 1888, and in 1893 he became professor of Church history in Union Theological Seminary, where he remained until his retirement in 1927. He was president of the seminary from 1917 to 1926. Among his writings were *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age* (1897); *The Apostles Creed: its Origin, and its Historical Interpretation* (1902); *Martin Luther, the Man and his Work* (1911); *Jonathan Edwards* (1932); and *A History of Christian Thought,* of which the first two volumes had appeared before his death. The second volume takes the subject as far as Erasmus.

The sudden death on December 9, 1932 of Professor A. Elizabeth Levett is a great loss to the study of Medieval economic history. She was born in 1881, at Bodiam, Sussex, took a brilliant first in the modern history school in Oxford and an M. A. in 1907, studied for some time in Paris at the École des Chartes and the École des Hautes Études. In 1910 she became history tutor, and later also vice principal of St. Hilda's College, Oxford. In 1923 she went to London as history tutor in King's College, University of London, and in 1929 became professor of history in Westfield College, University of London. Her publications were chiefly in the field of early English history and were of much importance. She published a volume on the *Effects of the Black Death on the Estates of the Bishopric of Winchester* (Oxford Studies, vol. V., 1916), and various articles on economic subjects, especially on the material at St. Albans, in the *Transactions* of the Royal Historical Society (1924), in the F. Lot *Mélanges* (1925), and in the *Economic History Review,* of which she was an editor. She was, at the time of her death, engaged upon a very important study, eagerly awaited, of the court rolls of St. Albans. N. N.

Archibald Henry Sayce, distinguished Orientalist, died on February 4 at the age of 87. Among the positions held by him was the chair of Assyriology at Oxford, 1891–1919. He was a prolific writer. A few titles may be selected: *Records of the Past,* first and second series (1874–1877, 1888–1892); *The Ancient Empires of the East* (1884); *The Hittites* (1889); *Babylonians and Assyrians: Life and Customs* (1899); *Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assouan* (1906); and *The Archæology of Cuneiform Inscriptions* (1907).

Announcement is made of the appointment of visiting professors for the summer sessions of the following universities: *California* [Berkeley] Adriaan Barnouw, Carleton Beals, Waldemar Westergaard; *California* [Los Angeles] Robert J. Kerner, Ephraim Lipson; *Chicago,* Bernard Faÿ; *Colorado,* R. D. W. Connor, Emily G. Hickman, C. H. Oldfather; *Columbia,* Carl Becker, R. G. Caldwell, A. T. Olmstead, Nathaniel Schmidt, Carl Stephenson; *Cornell,* Leo Gershoy, Horace Kidger; *Duke,* E. M. Coulter, E. M. Hulme, Ross McLean; *Harvard,* F. B. Artz, J. W. Pratt, H. D. Jordan; *Johns Hopkins,* J. L. Glanville; *Michigan,* P. V. B. Jones; *Missouri,* Louis Pelzer; *Nebraska,* Donald McFayden, R. E. Reynolds; *Northwestern,* W. P. Webb; *Pennsylvania State,* W. H. Eddy, P. W. Gates; *Stanford,* G. S. Ford; *Virginia,* C. C. Pearson; *West Virginia,* C. W. Ramsdell; *Western Reserve,* Huntley Dupre.

Professor E. E. Curtis, of Wellesley College, is on leave of absence for the current semester, and Professor Laura A. White, of the University of Wyoming, is taking his place.

Mr. James Truslow Adams, the historian, has been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature.

Professor John C. Parish, of the University of California, has received a research appointment for the coming summer at the Huntington Library.

It is proposed to present to Professor James Tait on his seventieth birthday, June 19, a volume of essays to commemorate his services to history and to many historians, his former students. The volume will be edited by Mr. V. H. Galbraith, of Balliol, Mr. J. G. Edwards, of Jesus College, and Professor E. F. Jacob, one of Dr. Tait's successors in the Manchester School of History. Subscriptions may be sent to Mr. H. M. McKechnie, 38 Derby Road, Fallowfield, Manchester.

The Société des Amis du Prince de Ligne (1735–1814) requests photostat copies of letters of the prince or addressed to him. The expense will be paid by the society which is preparing the *Correspondance Générale du Prince de Ligne.* Communications may be addressed to the Secrétaire général, M. Félicien Leuridant, Avenue de Visé, 92, at Watermael lez Bruxelles, Belgium.

GENERAL

General review: Paul Van Tieghem, *Histoire Littéraire Générale et Comparée, Seizième Compte Rendu Annuel* (Rev. de Synthèse, Dec.); H.

Zatschek, *Bericht über die Neuerscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Urkundenlehre 1930* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsfor., XLVI. 3–4); Renato d'Ambrosio, *Rassegna di Storia della Filosofia* (N. Riv. Stor., July); Julius Neubauer, *Die Wirtschaftsstatistischen Methoden* (Zeitsch. für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft, XCIII. 3); Paul Dudon, *Pour Écrire l'Histoire d'une Congrégation Religieuse* (Rev. d'Hist. de l'Église de France, Oct.).

The American Catholic Historical Association reports the Toronto meeting, December 27–29, to have been the most successful as well as the most pleasant in its history. Not only did the membership show some gain in spite of the depression, but with increased publication activities the treasury was found to be in a healthy condition. The committee on publications announced the appearance of vol. II. of the association's Papers (*The Church in Contemporary Europe*), and the early printing (in April) of vol. I. of its series of Documents: *United States Ministers to the Papal States, Instructions and Despatches,* edited by Leo Francis Stock. Dr. James F. Kenney's presidential address, on the Relations between Church and State in Canada since the Cession of 1763, appeared in the January number of the *Catholic Historical Review.* Officers elected for 1933 include: Dr. Constantine E. McGuire, president; Dr. Michael Williams and the Rev. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., vice presidents; Dr. Peter Guilday, secretary; and the Rev. John K. Cartwright, treasurer. At the meeting preliminary steps were taken for the organization of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association. L. F. S.

An instrument valuable to the historian is the *List of Serial Publications of Foreign Governments, 1815–1931,* edited by Winifred Gregory, for the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Library Association, and the National Research Council (H. W. Wilson Company, 1932). The committee in charge was Mr. J. T. Gerould, chairman, Princeton University Library, Mr. H. M. Lydenberg, the New York Public Library, and Mr. H. H. B. Meyer, the Library of Congress. This monumental task was begun in 1927, and part of the task had to be carried on in European capitals. The editor's introduction explains her method of procedure.

The 1933 issue of the *Political Handbook of the World,* edited by Walter H. Mallory (Harper and Brothers, for the Council on Foreign Relations, pp. 202, $2.50), is an indispensable reference book like its predecessors, but the number of recent political overturns gives this volume additional interest. Significant of the decay of parliamentary and party institutions is the number of times the word "Coalition", or a phrase of similar meaning, is prefixed to the word "Cabinet". It was inevitable that certain of the indications should become past history even while the book was going through the press; Paul Boncour, for example, as premier, and Kurt von Schleicher as chancellor. The section on the United States in a year when the administration changes was, for analogous reasons, difficult to arrange in such a way as to be correct

and serviceable, but the solution adopted looks like a vagary of the "lame duck" concept. Although the volume appeared in February when Mr. Hoover was still President, we do not find his name in the appropriate place, but instead that of Mr. Roosevelt as President-elect. No cabinet officers are mentioned; only an announcement that they are to be appointed on March 4. When that day arrived these items became out of date. Instead of having a statement that would be complete and correct at least a part of the year, we have one that is incomplete all the year.

At a Conférence Internationale pour l'Enseignement de l'Histoire, held last summer at The Hague, it was decided to form a permanent organization and to publish a quarterly *Bulletin*. The aim of the *Bulletin* will be to lay before teachers the differing points of view from which a particular historical question may be approached on one side or another of any great national frontier. For this purpose each number will contain typical extracts from the most widely used historical manuals, followed by criticisms written by historians belonging to a nationality different from that of the author. The general field of history will be divided into two series: Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Modern and Contemporary Times. There is no intention of eliminating the national type of history; it is hoped simply to keep history from being deformed by the spirit of hostility and prejudice. The *Bulletin* will also contain sections on bibliography, congresses, and surveys. The president of the conference is Professor R. Altamira, the distinguished Spanish historian. The editors of the *Bulletin* are Professor Jules Isaac and M. G. Lapierre, secretary of the Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Instituteurs. Those who wish to join the organization and receive the *Bulletin* may communicate with M. Lapierre at the Institut de Coopération Intellectuelle, 2 Rue Montpensier, Paris (I.). The fee is one dollar for individuals, and $4.00 for associations.

The Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution of Washington, has issued a *List of Doctoral Dissertations in History now in Progress at the Chief American Universities, December, 1932.*

The *Revue Historique* has printed its *Dixième Table Générale,* which includes vols. CLI. (1926)–CLXVIII. (1931).

It is fifty years since M. Henri Omont, "Conservateur" of the department of manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale, began his work of editing catalogues of the most important manuscripts in this vast collection. At the same time he has been engaged in publishing notices of the manuscripts especially precious and remarkable. These works touch the domains of Greek and Latin studies, of the literature of the Middle Ages, of paleography, diplomatics, illumination, printing, and libraries. The volumes are a mine of information in regard to all such questions. There has now appeared a *Bibliographie des Travaux de Monsieur Henri Omont* at the price of 55 francs.

Order blanks may be secured from the American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

The volumes entitled *Menschen die Geschichte Machten,* edited by Peter Richard Rohden and Georg Ostrogorsky, reviewed here a year ago, have won such a deserved success that they have appeared in a revised and enlarged edition (Vienna, L. W. Seidel and Son, 1933, pp. xi, 613; ix. 626, 13 M.). The distinguishing feature is a series of introductions to the periods of history to which the personages belong. These introductions are contributed by Albert Brackmann, Karl Brandi, Raymond Guyot, Heinrich Kretschmayr, Joachim Kühn, André Piganiol, Henri Sée, and Hans Erich Stier. They emphasize what is called the *geistesgeschichtliche Seite.* Although 140 pages have been added, the work is published in two volumes. Herr Peter Richard Rohden is the sole editor.

Students of historical geography will welcome the publication, *Premier Congrès International de Géographie Historique* (Brussels, 1930, 1932), edited by Professor F. Quicke of Brussels, secretary of the congress, held in Belgium in 1930; vol. I. (pp. 180) contains its proceedings, vol. II. (pp. 336), thirty-four of the papers read.

Dr. Solomon Zeitlin's essay entitled *An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures,* originally printed in the *Proceedings* of the American Academy for Jewish Research, 1931–1932, has been issued separately.

A work by Mr. Eli Ginzberg entitled *Studies in the Economics of the Bible* which appeared originally in the *Jewish Quarterly Review,* vol. XXII., no. 4, has now been revised and published separately (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1932, pp. 70).

Dr. Leonidas Pitamic, minister of Jugoslavia, has published in a revised and more complete form his *Treatise on the State* (Baltimore, J. H. Furst, 1933, pp. x, 301), originally printed in Slovene in 1927 by the Society of St. Mohor.

The presidential address of Dr. William F. Willoughby at the twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Political Science Association, entitled A Program for Research in Political Science, appears in the *American Political Science Review* for February.

To the Century Earth Science Series, edited by Kirtley F. Mather, has been added a volume entitled *The Geographic Factor: its Rôle in Life and Civilization,* by Ray H. Whitbeck and Olive J. Thomas, of the department of geography, the University of Wisconsin (Century Company, 1932, pp. xv, 422, $2.25).

Articles: André Blum, *Les Origines du Papier* (Rev. Hist., Nov.);

Philip C. Jessup and Francis Deák, *The Early Development of the Law of Contraband of War* [I., II.] (Pol. Sci. Quar., Dec., Mar.); Robert C. Clark, *Why History Needs to be Rewritten* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Dec.).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The editors of the *Musée Belge* announce that circumstances compel the discontinuance of this journal with the issue of the current numbers.

The Year's Work in Classical Studies (1932) reviews books and articles in Greek and Roman history published between June, 1931, and June, 1932. Besides the papyrological review published regularly in *Aegyptus*, there is a Bulletin Papyrologique by P. Collart in the *Revue des Études Grecques* for December. In the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* (X. 3–4), U. Wilcken reviews recent publications of papyri, and L. Wenger continues his review of legal literature. E. Schönbauer's Rechtshistorische Urkundenstudien in the same number may also be noted. De Lacy O'Leary contributes a bibliography of Christian Egypt to the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* for November.

In *Art and Archaeology* (December) H. W. Wagstaffe describes the excavations of Mohenjo Daro. The preliminary report of the excavations at Tell el-Amarna, 1931–1932, by J. D. S. Pendelbury, appears in the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* (November). Comte du Mesnil du Buisson reports in *Syria* (1932, 2) on the excavations at Khan Shikoun. E. A. Speiser gives an account of the joint excavations at Tepe Gawra in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for December. A report of the year's work in Palestinian archæology appears in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* (LV. 4). C. F. Lehmann-Haupt also gives a review of new discoveries in *Klio* (XXVI. 1). The Excavations at Troy, 1932, by C. W. Blegen in the *American Journal of Archæology* for December is important, and special interest also attaches to the report by T. L. Shear, in the same number, of the excavations in the Agora. One may also note Y. Béquignon and P. Devambez on the excavations in Thasos, 1925–1931, in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* (LVI. 1). R. G. Collingwood and M. V. Taylor report on Roman finds in Britain during 1931 in the *Journal of Roman Studies* (1932, 2).

A number of articles have appeared recently dealing with questions in economic history. A. Kocevalov in *Rheinisches Museum* (LXXXI. 4) studies the importation of corn at Athens. G. Glotz in the *Revue Historique*, December, discusses the finances of Athens from 346 to 339 B. C. with reference to Demosthenes. R. Scalais contributes a rather lengthy and important article on the agrarian policy of Rome from the Punic wars to the Gracchi, in the *Musée Belge* (XXXIV. 7–10). Tenney Frank, in the *American Journal of Philology* for December, concludes from a study of the sum which accumulated in the *aerarium sanctius* between 81 and 49 B. C.

that the rate of manumission in Rome during that period averaged 16,000 persons per annum. In *Classical Philology,* January, the same author seeks to show that the equestrian corporations in Rome did not have an opportunity to make huge profits before 150 B. C. One may note also A. Calderini's Nuove Schede del Censimento Romano d'Egitto, in *Aegyptus* (December), and F. Heichelheim's study in *Klio* (XXVI. 1), of the crisis relating to prices and values in the Roman empire during the third century A. D.

A group of articles may be noted which deal with questions of historiography and the criticism of primary documents: J. Sturm on the dating of the El-Amarna letters, in *Klio* (XXVI. 1); C. A. Robinson, jr., in the *American Journal of Philology* (December), seeks to identify two notices from the *ephemerides* of Alexander's expedition; W. Ensslin, a note on the Res Gestae Divi Augusti, in *Rheinisches Museum* (LXXXI. 4); and Ch. Hülsen, in the same journal, on the new fragments of the *acta* of the Saecular Games of 204 A. D.

Studies on Scipio Africanus, by R. M. Haywood (Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science, series LI. 1), is an interesting and distinctly worth-while piece of work. It is not an attempt to write a biography of Scipio but to discuss some unsettled problems connected with his character and career. The author's analysis of the Scipio legend into elements which were contemporary and elements which were later accretions is well carried out, although one may question how far Ennius was the creator and how far merely the exponent of a tradition. The author's attack upon Polybius's judgment of Scipio is plausible but depends on a rather uncertain factor, how much information Polybius actually received from Laelius. There follows a valuable study of the probable political associations of the chief public men of Rome during Scipio's dominance, of Scipio's own influence in holding Rome to a Philhellenic policy, and a fresh estimate of the sources and reconstruction of the events which concern the trials of the Scipios.

The *History of the Roman Republic* by Cyril E. Robinson (Crowell) continues the series of textbooks in which he has published his *History of Greece.* It is a good textbook which presents much information in a clear and straightforward fashion, and has many maps. It touches on almost all aspects of Roman political, imperial, and cultural developments from the beginning to the death of Caesar, and seems to be well abreast of the chief results of recent historical research.

A volume entitled *Mélanges Gustav Glotz,* in honor of the well-known French historian, contains eighty-one articles or memoirs. Among the contributors are Professors W. S. Ferguson, Tenney Frank, M. I. Rostovtzeff, and A. B. West. It is published by Les Presses Universitaires de France (pp. 940, 150 fr.).

Articles: E. A. Speiser, *On some Important Synchronisms in Prehistoric Mesopotamia* (Amer. Jour. Arch., Dec.); M. V. Oppenheimer, *Tell Halaf: la plus Ancienne Civilisation Soubaréenne de Mésopotamie* (Syria, 1932, 2); T. J. C. Baly, *The Relation of the Eleventh Dynasty and the Heracleopolitans* (Jour. Egypt. Arch., Nov.); J. M. P. Smith, *The Indebtedness of Israel to its Neighbours* (Amer. Jour. Sem. Lang., Jan.); M. Mühl, *Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen und Althellenischen Gesetzgebung* (Klio, Beiheft 29); H. T. Wade-Gery, *The Laws of Cleisthenes* (Class. Quart., Jan.); H. G. Robertson, *Democracy and Oligarchy under the Athenian Empire* (Class. Phil., Jan.); F. Miltner, *Die Staatsrechtliches Entwickelung des Alexanderreiches* (Klio, XXVI., 1); M. Hadas, *The Social Revolution in Third Century Sparta* (Class. Weekly, Dec. 12, 19); M. Roussel, *Delphes et l'Amphictionie après la Guerre d'Aitolie* (Bull. Corr. Hell., LVI. 1); J. Bidez, *La Cité du Monde et la Cité du Soleil chez les Stoïciens* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Bull., Lettres, XVIII. 7–9); W. W. Tarn, *The Oarage of Greek Warships* (Mariner's Mirror, Jan.); P. Fraccaro, *La Storia dell' Antichissimo Esercito Romano* (Atti del 2° Cong. Naz. di Studi Rom., V. 3); E. T. Salmon, *The Last Latin Colony* (Class. Quart., Jan.); G. de Sanctis, *La Origine dell' Edilità Plebea* (Riv. di Filol., Dec.); F. B. Marsh, *The Gangster in Roman Politics* (Class. Jour., Dec.); W. W. Tarn, *Alexander Helios and the Golden Age* (Jour. Rom. Stud., 1932, 2); Ch. Jusserand, *La Testament de Claude* (Musée Belge, XXXIV. 7–10); H. Box, *Roman Citizenship in Laconia,* [II.] (Jour. Rom. Stud., 1932, 2); A. Solari, *Il Non Intervento nel Conflitto tra la Persia e Valente* (Klio, XXVI., 1); Oskar Ring, *Das Basiliusproblem* (Zeitsch. für Kirchengesch., 1932, III., IV.).

T. R. S. B.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

General review: Henri Laurent, *Les Travaux de M. Henri Pirenne sur la Fin du Monde Antique et Les Débuts du Moyen Age* (Byzantion, VII. 2, 1932); Carlo Cecchelli, *Civiltà Medievale* (N. Antol., Feb. 1).

The Mediaeval Academy of America has recently published *Borough and Town, a Study of Urban Origins in England,* by Carl Stephenson and *Ordination Anointings in the Western Church before 1000 A. D.,* by Gerald Ellard as nos. 7 and 8 of its Monograph Series.

The Revue Historique du Droit Français et Étranger for October, 1932, contains digests of sixteen important papers delivered during the Semaine d'Histoire du Droit Normand held at Caen last June.

Isis for January contains the Thirty-Fourth Critical Bibliography of the History and Philosophy of Science and of the History of Civilization (to March 1932).

Articles: G. Ostrogorsky, *Löhne und Preise in Byzanz* (Byzant. Zeitsch.,

XXXII. 2); F. Dölger, *Die Chronologie des Grossen Feldzuges des Kaisers Johannes Tzimiskes gegen die Russen* (*ibid.*); J. D. Stefănescu, *Le Roman de Barlaam et Joasaph illustré en Peinture* (Byzantion, VII. 2, 1932); Bruno Krusch, *Die Handschriftlichen Grundlagen der Historia Francorum Gregors von Tours* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Jan.); François L. Ganshof, *Les Vicissitudes d'un Foyer de Civilisation Européen: le Pays Mosan avant le XIII^e Siècle* (Rev. de Synthèse, Dec.); P. Boisonnade, *Cluny, la Papauté et la Première Grande Croisade Internationale contre les Sarrasins d'Espagne, 1064–1065* (Rev. des Quest. Hist., Oct.); Carl Erdmann, *Endkaiserglaube und Kreuzzugsgedanke im XI. Jahrhundert* (Zeitsch. für Kirchengesch, 1932, III., IV.); Henry L. Savage, *Hunting in the Middle Ages* (Speculum, Jan., 1933); G. G. Coulton, *A Sidelight on the Medieval Visitation System* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Marc Bloch, *Le Problème de l'Or au Moyen Age* (An. Hist. Éc. et Soc. Jan.); H. Matrod, *A propos de Fr. André de Longjumeau, O. P.* (Études Franciscaines, Nov, 1932); Henri Laurent, *Droit des Foires et Droits Urbains aux XIII^e et XIV^e Siècles* (Rev. Hist. de Droit Français et Étranger, Oct.); Max A. Shepard, *William of Occam and the Higher Law* (Am. Pol. Sci. Rev., Dec., Feb.); S. Harrison Thomson, *Pre-Hussite Heresy in Bohemia* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Carl Erdmann, *Kaiserfahne und Blutfahne* (Sitzungsber. der Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften, XXVIII., 1932); Paul Lehmann, *Die Grammatik aus Aldhelms Kreise* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Jan.); Werner Ohnsorge, *"Kaiser" Konrad III.; zur Geschichte des Staufischen Staatsgedankens* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsfor., XLVI. 3–4); F. Fossati, *Per il Commercio delle Armature e i Missaglia* (Arch. Stor. Lombardo, Nov.); A. Monteverdi, *Pier della Vigna nella "Imago Mundi" di Iacopo d'Acqui* (Studi Medievali, Nov., 1931 [1932]).

G. C. B.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: Arthur P. Scott, *Some Recent Textbooks* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); Arved Freih. v. Taube, *Die Baltische Geschichtswissenschaft in der Nachkriegszeit* (Archiv für Kulturgesch., XXIII. 2).

Egon Friedell's *Cultural History of the Modern Age*, vol. II. of which was noticed in this journal (XXXVII. 625), has reached its conclusion in the English version by C. F. Atkinson with a third volume covering the period from the Congress of Vienna to the World War (Knopf, 1932, pp. ix, 489, xlix, $5.00). The brilliancy of style and suggestiveness of ideas are once more striking. To a greater degree than in vol. II., the author emphasizes his belief in the fundamental irrationality of the historical process. "For world-history is not an equation, not even one with several solutions" (p. 478). Though he is more concrete and ironically humorous than Spengler, Friedell is the exponent of the same pessimistic philosophy of history, as appears from the titles of his six chapters, The Depth of Emptiness, the Discordant Song,

Bubble Business, Black Friday, Gone to the Devil, The Collapse of Reality. Yet the last chapter suggests that experimental psychology and experimental physics tend to show that "the soul is super-real". He thinks he detects "a faint gleam of light from the other side" and ends on the reassuring if slightly vague note that "the next chapter of European cultural history will be the history of this light". E. N. C.

M. Maurice Paléologue's *Un Prélude à l'Invasion de Belgique: le Plan Schlieffen, 1904* (Paris, Plon, 1932, pp. 173, 9 fr.) is largely a reprint of extracts from the author's diary published in the October issue of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* as Pages de Journal, 1904–1905: les Révélations du Vengeur. The extracts relate, first, to the purported betrayal in the period from January to April, 1904, by a mysterious stranger, presumably a member of the German general staff, of the great Von Schlieffen plan, and second, to the Anglo-French-Belgian military conversations providing for close coöperation in case of war with Germany. According to Paléologue, the revelations of the *Vengeur* were not only a principal cause of the military understandings, but they furnish clear proof that Germany, and not the Allies, first impinged upon Belgian neutrality. But according to German military historians, the great Von Schlieffen plan was not adopted by the German general staff till April, 1905, that is, one entire year after the revelations of the *Vengeur*. According to them, the plan actually put into effect in April, 1904, was merely one of the annual editions of the plan of 1899, and provided only for the advance of the German right wing across the southern corner of Belgium, east, not west, of the Meuse. It would th efore have been impossible for the *Vengeur*, in 1904, to communicate the great Von Schlieffen plan with its provision for the advance of large bodies of troops through central Belgium west of the Meuse, a whole year before it was actually adopted. Further light is thrown on the question by the fact that the French military authorities were apparently not impressed by the revelations. Not only did Paléologue note this, but the subsequent plans of the French staff made no provision against the great German enveloping movement on the French left along both sides of the Meuse as described by Paléologue. On the contrary, they did provide against a German attack through Luxemburg and Belgium east of the Meuse. This may have been due to French possession of information of various sorts such as that contained in the several German *Kriegspiele*, which became known to them. On the other hand, Fernand Engerand, a well-informed writer, asserts that the French were in possession of a German plan of concentration for such an attack east of the Meuse, a plan whose substance was published by Colonel Buat in March, 1914, and distributed to all officers designated for high command. Because of its nature, this plan could not have been of later date than 1904. The possibility suggests itself, therefore, that this was the plan actually communicated by the *Vengeur*, and that

Paléologue is in error about its nature. If the plan was really the more restricted one, the moral effect of the revelation cannot have been so great as with the plan Paléologue describes. We do know that the French general staff was not seriously disturbed, for it repressed as heretic alarmists such officers as Michel and Herment who called attention to the danger from the North. Furthermore, as late as 1911, the restricted German plan, and not the one described by Paléologue, was used in the conferences with the British. Why, if they had the larger and much more important plan, which supposedly caused such consternation in 1904–1905, was it overlooked? In view of these questions it is doubtful whether the revelations and their interpretation can be accepted at face value. W. E. L.

Francisco de Vitoria is a series of addresses in commemoration of the fourth centenary of Vitoria's "De Indis" and "De Iure Belli", which were delivered at the Catholic University of America on May 1, 1932. The speakers were Reverend Charles H. McKenna, Professor Herbert Wright, and Dr. James Brown Scott. Professor Wright is editor of the pamphlet.

Dr. Jan Romein, one of whose volumes is reviewed on another page, has given a survey of the present situation of the world and its leading peoples in *Machten van dezen Tijd: Overzicht van de voornaamste Problemen der Hedenaagsche Internationale Politiek* (Amsterdam, Wereldbibliotheek, 1932, pp. 424, 3.75 fl.).

The historian innocent of the technique of engineering, but desiring to include in his survey the achievements in that field, will discover a friend in need in a volume by two members of the Yale faculty, Richard Shelton Kirby and Philip Gustave Laurson, with the title *The Early Years of Modern Engineering* (Yale University Press, 1932, pp. xvi, 324, $4.00). The primary purpose of the work is to give engineers a clearer knowledge of the history of their profession. It is abundantly illustrated. Its topical arrangement makes it a valuable reference book.

Articles: Hans A. Genzsch, *Die Anlage der Aeltesten Sammlung von Briefen Æneas Silvio Piccolominis* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsfor., XLVI. 3–4); Wilhelm Stolze, *Der Geistige Hintergrund des Bauernkrieges: Erasmus und Luther* (Zeitsch. für Kirchengesch., 1932, III., IV.); Pierre Costil, *Paul Manuce et l'Humanisme à Padoue à l'Époque du Concile de Trente* (Rev. des Quest. Hist., Oct.); Diego Angeli, *L'Arte della Controriforma* (N. Antol., Feb. 1); John Horsch, *The Rise and Early History of the Swiss Brethren Church: the Beginnings at Zurich* [II.] (Mennonite Quar. Rev., Oct.); Pierre Monbeig, *Vie de Relations et Spécialisation Agricole: les Baléares au XVIII^e Siècle* (An. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., Nov.); Jean Hankiss, *Les Caractères Nationaux et leur Représentation. Un Exemple: le Portrait du Hongrois dans l'Opinion Occidentale* (*Rev. de Synthèse*, Dec.);

J. Rutkowski, *Les Bases Économiques des Partages de l'Ancienne Pologne* (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., July); Ping Chia Kuo, *Caleb Cushing and the Treaty of Wanghia, 1844* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); B. H. Sumner, *The Secret Franco-Russian Treaty of 3 March 1859* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Comte Sforza, *Autour d'Algésiras; Souvenirs Diplomatiques* (Rev. de Paris, Jan. 15); Hans Rothfels, *Studien zur Annexionskrisis von 1908/09* (Hist. Zeitsch., Dec. 28); Hans Uebersberger, *Zur Vorkriegsgeschichte Serbiens* (Berl. Monatsh., Jan.); J. Isaac, *Le Problème des Origines de la Guerre: trois Solutions Américaines* [II.] (Rev. d'Hist. Mod., July); B. E. Schmitt, *The Origins of the War* (National Rev., Jan.).

Documents and letters: Helmut Eckert, ed., *Ein Gutachten des Markgrafen Ludwig Wilhelm von Baden-Baden zu dem mit der Türkei zu Schliessenden Frieden aus dem Jahre 1698* (Mitteil. des Oesterr. Inst. für Geschichtsfor., XLVI. 3–4); Frederick W. Hoeing, ed., *Letters of Mazzini to W. J. Linton* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); Karl Demeter, ed., *Politische Berichte Ludwigs Frh. von Gebsattels, des Bayerischen Militärbevollmächtigten in Berlin 1905–1911* [I.] (Preuss. Jahr., Jan.).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Two of the contributions printed in vol. XV., fourth series, of the *Transactions* of the Royal Historical Society, have Sir Richard Lodge as their author. One is the presidential address on Sir Benjamin Keene, K. B.: A Study in Anglo-Spanish Relations; the other is an account of the Polwarth Papers, published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Three volumes have appeared and two are to follow. Evidently Sir Richard thinks that the editing leaves much to be desired and he is especially severe in regard to the practice in such a collection of translating dispatches originally written in French. Among the papers are: The Transference of Lands in England, 1640–1660, by Rev. H. Egerton Chesney, and The Secret Service under Charles II. and James II., by James Walker.

Two lectures before the British Academy are published as pamphlets in advance of vol. XVIII. of its *Proceedings* (London, Humphrey Milford): the Raleigh Lecture by Dr. G. G. Coulton on Some Problems in Medieval Historiography, severely dogmatic along characteristic lines, and a Henriette Hertz Lecture on Cicero by Professor Tenney Frank of the Johns Hopkins University, an appreciative treatment of the statesman, the orator, the philosopher, and especially the humanist.

Dr. Moses Tyson, librarian of the John Rylands Library, publishes in the January *Bulletin* the second Hand-List of Charters, Deeds, and Similar Documents in the Possession of the Library. The first list of similar material was begun by Dr. R. Fawtier, in 1925.

With the November *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research appears the third *Supplement* containing the Guide to the Historical Publications of the Societies of England and Wales for 1931.

The most recent volume of the *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III.* covers the years 1256–1259 (H. M. Stationery Office, pp. vii, 584, 40*s*.).

In *The Growth of Modern England* (Constable) Dr. Gilbert Slater has revised and brought down to date his well known *Making of Modern England*.

The fourth volume of Hilaire Belloc's *History of England* (Putnam's, 1932, pp. xii, 457, $4.00), covering the years from 1525 to 1612, is frankly not a contribution to the scholarship of the Reformation period, but rather an essay in reinterpretation, drawing its inspiration from Mr. Belloc's Roman Catholicism. The facts are, in most instances, Pollard's. Because Belloc does not share the great historian's "strong religious feeling", he allows more play for such factors as the greed of the laity for monastic property in his judgment of men and motives. Even in this, as in the views that the spread of the new religion was a slow and gradual process and that the Cecils were more powerful than their sovereigns, there is nothing original. Such ideas are already current in college textbooks, of which the volume is merely a glorified example. F. C. D.

The Scottish History Society has published in two volumes *The Warrender Papers*, for a long time supposed to be lost. They throw an important light upon many problems of Scottish history in the time of Queen Mary and of James VI. For one thing they give the commission from Pope Julius III. to Archbishop Hamilton of St. Andrews which conferred legatine powers. The main interest of the first volume centers about Mary Stuart, while the second volume carries the story to the eve of James's accession to the English throne. The editor is Annie I. Cameron, and Robert S. Rait has furnished an introduction.

The Oxinden Letters (Constable), edited by Dorothy Gardiner, is a useful addition to the collections of family correspondence on which students of English society in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have to depend.

In *A Hundred Years of Quarter Sessions: the Government of Middlesex from 1660 to 1760*, E. G. Dodwell (Cambridge University Press) gives an account of the activities of the justices of the peace based on the quarter sessions records. Sir William Holdsworth contributes an introduction dealing chiefly with local government in the eighteenth century.

Vol. XIII., third series, of the *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland* includes the years 1686–1689. The editor is Henry Paton, and there is an introduction by Robert Kerr Hannay (Edinburgh, H. M. General Register House, pp. lxxvi, 735, 45*s*.).

The Navy Records Society has published vol. III. of *The Byng Papers,* covering the period from January, 1711, to October, 1717. The large-scale operations of the War of the Spanish Succession had already ceased, and the defense of trade against privateering was the main concern until the war ended. After that there were measures against the invasion of the Old Pretender and an expedition into the Baltic in 1717.

Gilbert Armitage's *The History of the Bow Street Runners, 1729–1829* (London, Wishart, 12*s.* 6*d.*), reminds the reader that London, like other large cities of the eighteenth century, had no police in the modern sense of the term. Henry Fielding, who in 1748 was appointed to the Commission of the Peace for Middlesex and Westminister, is regarded to have made a beginning of a paid police. The last of this succession of justices, Sir Richard Birnie, lived long enough to see the "Peelers" on duty.

Students who have read the long and interesting letter, written from Philadelphia, June 1, 1793, to William Windham and printed in the *Windham Papers* (ed. Rosebery), I. 121–136, under the heading "An Unknown Correspondent to William Windham", may like to know that the writer was the Vicomte de Noailles. This is shown by data in Philadelphia newspapers of the time.

A volume which deals with the time when Liverpool built ships as well as docked them is *Liverpool Ships in the Eighteenth Century, including the King's Ships built there,* by R. Stewart-Brown (Liverpool, the University Press, 1932, pp. 148, 10*s.* 6*d.*). One of the largest and finest ships, the *Hall* was designed by William Hutchinson. Her tonnage was 375, while the average tonnage for merchant ships of the period was 200. Liverpool's rôle as a shipbuilding center ended practically with the century, pushed aside by her interests as a port.

Sir Charles Mallet's *Herbert Gladstone: a Memoir* (Hutchinson) is a discriminating study of a secondary political figure who was always handicapped by being his father's son.

Mr. Winston S. Churchill's power as a chronicler of events, illustrated in his narratives of the World War, is exhibited once more, on a smaller scale, in a number of tales from his own experience entitled *Amid these Storms* (Scribner's, 1932, pp. 319, $3.50). The Battle of Sidney Street is a fine example of his skill. As the subtitle, *Thoughts and Adventures,* suggests, there are chapters of comment on the present situation of the world. One chapter tells why, like another political leader of the present day, he is a collector of cartoons in which he is himself the principal figure.

An important contribution to a question now on the list of a troubled world's serious problems is *The Constitution of the Irish Free State,* by Leo

Kohn, with a foreword by Hon. Hugh Kennedy, chief justice of the Irish Free State (London, Allen and Unwin, pp. xv, 423, 16s.). Here is explained the incongruity of a state, republican in theory, set by the provisions of a treaty in a framework of a monarchy. The exact powers of all the officials are precisely stated.

Articles: R. R. Darlington, *Æthelwig, Abbot of Evesham* [I.] (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); Geoffrey Baskerville, *Married Clergy and Pensioned Religious in Norwich Diocese* [I.] (*ibid.*); David and Gervase Mathew, *Iron Furnaces in South-Eastern England and English Ports and Landing-places* (*ibid.*); Beryl Smalley, *Exempla in the Commentaries of Stephen Langton* (Bull. John Rylands Library, Jan.); F. W. Brooks, *The Cinque Ports' Feud with Yarmouth in the Thirteenth Century* (Mariner's Mirror, Jan.); A. C. Baugh, *Documenting Sir Thomas Malory* (Speculum, Jan.); W. S. Sparrow, *Thoughts on the English Newspaper, 1632–1932* (Nineteenth Century and After, Feb.); Clyde L. Grose, *The Dunkirk Money, 1662* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); F. C. Gore, *A Seventeenth Century Barrister* (Quar. Rev., Jan.); L. I. Bredvold, *Notes on John Dryden's Pension* (Mod. Philol., Feb.); G. Bullough, *Fulk Greville, First Lord Brooke* (Mod. Lang. Rev., Jan.); R. D. Richards, *Mr. Pepys and the Goldsmith Bankers* (Ec. Hist., Jan.); G. E. Fussell, *Farmers' Calendars from Tusser to Arthur Young* (*ibid.*); Herbert Heaton, *An Early Victorian Business Forecaster in the Woolen Industry* (*ibid.*); R. S. Sayers, *The Question of the Standard in the Eighteen-Fifties* (*ibid.*); G. A. Ballard, *British Battleships of 1870: the* ZEALOUS *and the* REPULSE (Mariner's Mirror, Jan.); Algernon Cecil, *Lord Oxford and Asquith* (Quar. Rev., Jan.).

Documents and letters: James F. Willard, ed., *Ordinances for the Guidance of a Deputy Treasurer, 22 October 1305* (Eng. Hist. Rev., Jan.); J. H. Owen, ed., *Letters from Sir Samuel Hood* [the last of which makes interesting comments on the Battle of The Saints] (Mariner's Mirror, Jan.).

FRANCE

General review: Henri Hauser, *Histoire de France, Histoire Moderne, 1498–1660* (Rev. Hist., Nov.).

The *Dictionnaire de Biographie Française*, which is under the direction of J. Balteau, M. Barroux, and M. Prevost, has reached the name Alicot with the sixth fascicle, which completes the first volume.

The Musée de la Cooperation Franco-Américaine at the Chateau of Blérancourt is preparing an exhibition of material on the French travelers and émigrés who resided for a time in the region now included in the United States.

To the series of the Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age,

which is under the direction of Louis Halphen, has been added *Ermold le Noir: Poème sur Louis le Pieux et Épitres au Roi Pépin,* translated and edited by Edmond Faral, professor at the Collège de France (Paris, Champion, 1932, pp. xxxv, 267, 27 fr.). The text and translation appear on opposite pages, to the convenience of the student.

An exhaustive study of printing and publishing in Anjou from the fifteenth to the end of the eighteenth century has been made by Émile Pasquier and Victor Dauphin in *Imprimeurs et Libraires de l'Anjou* (Angers, Soc. anon. des Éditions de l'Ouest, 1932, pp. 408). The organization of the book-trade at different periods, technical processes, the life of the printers, an account of the various firms, bibliographical notices of their publications, and an indication of the libraries where the most important may be found, are among the contents of this interesting volume.

M. Louis Batiffol's *La Vie de Paris sous Louis XIII.; l'Existence Pittoresque des Parisiens au XVII^e Siècle* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1932, pp. iii, 252, 15 fr.) is the first of a new series of volumes upon Notre Vieux Paris. M. Batiffol's studies upon the period are well known, but this volume will possess an especial charm for those who have wandered over Paris, seeking the older city in the midst of the new.

The University of Pennsylvania Press has published a study by Miss Edith Philips entitled *The Good Quaker in French Legend* (1932, pp. x, 235, $2.50), showing the importance of this religious sect on French thought of the eighteenth century, and the development of a rather sentimental and idealized conception of the Quakers in the French mind. Parts of chapter 4 were first published in this journal in October, 1930.

Somewhat obscured today by the fame of more distinguished *Philosophes,* the Abbé Mably had at the time of the French Revolution a very considerable reputation. Believing in a communist order as the ideally best, he recognized its impossibility for his time and contended for a government of balanced powers as a second best system, in which laws rather than men should rule, which should be organized along federalist lines and whose guiding principle should be to foster virtue and happiness. Though his theories were similar to those of Montesquieu and Rousseau, he differed from both in important particulars and stood in some respects closer than either to the views of the majority of the Constituent Assembly. His authority was often cited in the constitutional debates of this body, notably in the discussions on whether the right to make war and peace belonged to the legislative or the executive power and in those on the death-penalty. The decisions were made according to the exigencies of the situation, but the theories had their weight, even though secondary. All this and more is interestingly set forth by Georg Müller in his useful monograph, *Die Gesellschafts- und Staatslehren des*

Abbés Mably und ihr Einfluss auf das Werk der Konstituante (Berlin, Ebering, 1932, pp. 123), being the first of a series of Forschungen zur Geschichte des Ancien Régime und der Grossen Revolution, edited by Otto Becker in the general collection Historische Studien. E. N. C.

It is one of the anomalies of historical inquiry that the responsibilities of an event like the September Massacres are still the subject of active discussion. Of course part of the evidence was destroyed in the fires of the Commune. M. Gérard Walter has attempted in a volume entitled *Les Massacres de Septembre: Étude Critique* (Paris, Payot, 1932, pp. 174, 15 fr.), to revise the conclusions of his predecessors, and M. Pierre Caron in a recent series of articles in *La Révolution Française* has shown, by a more precise application of the rules of historical criticism, that certain supposedly established elements of the story rest upon no substantial foundation. An example is the famous Panis-Sergent order. M. Walter's approach to the problem is somewhat novel. He does not center attention upon the action of the municipal council or of the committee of surveillance, but emphasizes the influences and passions at work in the sections or wards in which each prison was located. There are penetrating remarks, ironical in tone, upon the sinister traits of human weakness and depravity thrown up to the surface of this dreadful outburst of hatreds, fanaticism, and cruelty. The author relieves leaders like Danton, and even Marat, of anything more than passive complicity in the great jail delivery. These men were powerless for good or ill, and the most that can be said is that they were afraid to act. Many will regret that a "critical study" is without notes or references or discussion of evidence. It is provided, however, with a list of the principal narratives of the event arranged in chronological order.

Vol. V. of the *Histoire des Colonies Françaises et de l'Expansion de la France dans le Monde,* published under the direction of Gabriel Hanotaux and Alfred Martineau deals with *L'Inde et l'Indo-Chine,* and has as its authors Henri Froidevaux, Alfred Martineau, and Edmond Chassigneux (Paris, Plon, 1932, 150 fr.).

Plebiscites in France have not always led to wise decisions, but when the votes take the form of immense sales for a work of history or biography, it is safe to conclude that the book possesses high qualities of style and unusual interpretative value. This is true of M. Jacques Bainville's *Napoleon,* translated by Hamish Miles (Boston, Little, Brown, 1933, pp. xiv, 418, $3.75). As M. Bainville's aim is to give the *how?* and *why?* of Napoleon's career, his is not a narrative biography. Perhaps it will be most enjoyed by those already familiar with the details of the story. Open the pages where one will the comments are suggestive, often brilliant. Events do not follow one another in sober chronology, they seem to arrange themselves as parts of the setting

of a stage in order that the words and motions of the actor may be more intelligible. It is a pleasure to find the name of Albert Sorel among those whom the author regards as his teachers. A criticism of Bainville's general conception of Napoleon by M. Albert Meynier is found in *La Révolution Française* for October last.

To the series Les Énigmes de l'Histoire, M. Ferdinand Bac has added a volume upon *Napoléon Inconnu* (Paris, Alcan, 1932, pp. viii, 324, 15 fr.). It certainly begins at the beginning, for the first chapter is devoted to speculations touching Le Mystère de la Naissance. The volume as a whole deals with the period of exile and displays the mastery of detail to be expected of a writer so well known for his work on whatever concerns the Second Empire.

The *Journal (Paris-Saint-Pétersbourg), 1877–1883,* of Eugène Melchior de Vogüé has been published by Felix de Vogüé (Paris, Grasset, 1932, 18 fr.). It offers impressions of a noteworthy observer on the men and events of a critical period.

M. Louis Marlio in *La Véritable Histoire de Panama* (Paris, Hachette, 1932, pp. 93, 7 fr. 50) has told again the story of the great canal and analyzed the testimony upon which was based the condemnation in the Paris court of appeal of the two De Lesseps. He acknowledges that there were serious errors of judgment, but denies corrupt intent. Even when Charles de Lesseps paid huge sums to influential deputies, including a member of the cabinet, he was not so much guilty of corruption as a victim of blackmail. In his chapter on Politique et Corruption Parlementaire, M. Marlio reports De Lesseps as replying in the course of the interrogation that, when a great enterprise requiring public support is launched, "On voit arriver à soi une quantité de gens . . . ils sortent de desous chaque pavé. Il faut compter avec eux, avec leurs ménaces, avec leurs compromissions, avec leurs promesses". The author believes that, at the time when the crash came, the company, with adequate support, could have completed the canal in a few years and that it could have been made more profitable than it has since become under American control.

Articles: G. Dupont-Ferrier, *Les Institutions de la France sous le Règne de Charles V.* (Jour. des Sav., Nov.); Georges Goyau, *Jacques Gelu: ses Interventions pour Jeanne d'Arc* [apropos of the five hundredth anniversary of the death of this archbishop of Embrun] (Rev. des Quest. Hist., Oct.); Albert Mirot, *Tanguy du Chastel (1370–1458), ses Origines, sa Carrière jusqu'en 1415* (Rev. des Études Hist., Oct.); G. Espinas, *La Corporation des Boulangers-Patissiers d'Arras, 1356* (Rev. d'Hist. Éc. et Soc., 1932, 2); Elise Desprêaux, *Le Cabinet de Versailles et le Conflit entre la Russie et la Pologne en Courlande au Début du XVIII^e Siècle* [concl'd] (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., Oct.); Gérard Walter, *L'Apprentissage d'un Révolutionnaire; Marat avant 1789*

(Rev. des D. M., Feb. 1); G. Lenotre, *Aux Tuileries, Jadis* [I.-concl., 1789–1870] (*ibid.*, Dec. 15, Jan. 15); C. L. Benson, *How the French Deputies were paid in 1789–1791* (Jour. Mod. Hist., Mar.); Colonel Herlaut, *Les Négotiations de Custine* (An. Hist. de la Rév. Fr., Nov.); Georges Lefebvre, *Sur Danton* [II.] (*ibid.*); P. Vaillandet, *Le Plébiscite de l'An III.* (*ibid.*); E. Soreau, *La Révolution Française et le Prolétariat Rural* [II.] (*ibid.*, Jan.); Jean Dautry, *Sébastien Lacroix* (*ibid.*); Paul Mautouchet, *Les Idées d'un Urbaniste Parisien sous le Premier Empire* (Rev. Fr., Oct.); Lefebvre de Béhaine, *Le Crépuscule de l'Empire, le Commandement du Duc de Raguse* [II.] (Rev. des Quest. Hist., Oct.); Marquis de Monmorillon, *Au Soir de la Restauration: la Loi du "Sacrilège"* (Rev. des Études Hist., Oct.); C. Vidal, *La Monarchie de Juillet et le Saint-Siège au Lendemain de la Révolution de 1830* (Rev. d'Hist. Dipl., Oct.); A. Pinloche, *Fourier et le Socialisme: à propos du Centenaire du Phalanstère de Fourier, 1832–1932* [I.] (N. Rev., Jan. 15); E. J. Pratt, *La Diplomatie Française de 1875 à 1881* (Rev. Hist., Nov.).

Documents: Jean Hanoteau, ed., *Lettres de l'Impératrice Marie-Louise à la Reine Hortense* [1810–1815; seem to indicate that she was "the victim of the Emperor's enemies, not their accomplice"] (Rev. des D. M., Dec. 1).

THE NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

A complete history of the Dutch Mennonite movement in the sixteenth century has been published by W. Kühler under the title *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de Zestiende Eeuw* (Haarlem, Tjeenk-Willink, 1932, pp. 478).

The volume entitled *Kaapse Archiefstukken lopende over het Jaar 1782*, afgeschreven, bewerkt, en van een Register voorzien door Kathleen M. Jeffreys, M. A., van het Kaapse Archief, Deel I. (Cape Town, Union Archive Commission, 1931, pp. 592) aside from elaborate indexes of persons, places, ships, and subjects, consists of four elements, of which the largest is the journal (Resolutiën) of the Political Council, the others being the diaries kept at the castle and the council's incoming and outgoing letters. The rule of the Dutch East India Company, under which the Cape was in many respects a dependency of Batavia, was declining toward its end, there was war with England and dissatisfaction with Governor Joachim van Plettenberg, and the sojourn of the Duke of Luxemburg's regiment (hired for the company's service in the East Indies) pressed on the colony's scanty resources. Otherwise the annals are those of a small pastoral and agricultural colony. How greatly the British war against the republic affected Dutch maritime interests and East Indian connections may be seen from the index of ships calling in Table Bay or sighted or reported. Of the whole number 72 are French against only 69 Dutch; 24 are Danish, five Imperial, four Swedish, two

Portuguese. Eight are English, mostly frigates, but including also the *Grosvenor,* whose wreck was so famous. The editing is excellent. J. F. J.

Articles: J. Gessler, *Les Catalogues des Bibliothèques Monastiques de Lobbes et de Stavelot* [1049, 1105] (Rev. d'Hist. Ecclésiastique, Jan.); J. de Sturler, *Les Relations Politiques de l'Angleterre et du Brabant sous Edouard I. et Edouard II. Plantagenet (1272–1326)* (Rev. Belge de Philol. et d'Hist., XI., July); P. Kauch, *Le Trésor de l'Épargne, Création de Philippe le Bon (ibid.)*; Ch. Mercier, *Les Théories Politiques des Calvinistes dans les Pays-Bas à la Fin du XVI^e^ et au Début du XVII^e^ Siècle* [democratic in theory, but restricting political power to the élite and especially to the estates general] (Rev. d'Hist. Ecclésiastique, Jan.); Wilhelm Vollert, *Der Prozess Johann van Oldenbarneveldt in Kirchengeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (Zeitsch. für Kirchengesch., 1932, III., IV.); Amry Vanderbosch, *Dutch and American Colonial Policy in the Malay Archipelago* (Hist. Outlook, Feb.).

GERMANY, SWITZERLAND, AND CENTRAL EUROPE

General review: Heinrich Otto Meisner, *Politik und Geschichte* [modern German history] (Preuss. Jahr., Dec.); P. Benaerts, *Histoire d'Allemagne au XIX^e^ Siècle* (Rev. Hist., Nov.).

The economic and social history of South Germany and its neighbors must draw heavily on the Schriften des Instituts für Sozialforschung in den Alpenländern an der Universität Innsbruck, edited by Professor K. Lamp. The tenth number is entitled *Südbayern und Westösterreich zu Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts; eine Bevölkerungs- und Sozialstatistische Darstellung,* by Adolph Günther (Innsbruck, Universitäts-Verlag Wagner, 1933, pp. xii, 212). The work, which rests on the great statistical investigation undertaken by the Bavarian minister Montgelas, is equipped with 92 tables and a statistical map.

By an inversion of chronology, vol. IV. of the *Memoirs of Prince von Bülow,* with the subtitle of *Early Years and Diplomatic Service, 1849–1897,* covers the first two-thirds of Bülow's life. The translators are Geoffrey Dunlop and F. A. Voigt (Little, Brown, 1932, pp. xv, 710, $5.00). Looking back on his sunny childhood, his happy love affairs, and his rapid diplomatic advancement under Bismarck's approving eye, Bülow gives a very pleasing picture of things as they were during the first quarter century of the new Bismarckian empire. There are generous appreciations of Bülow's fine old father, of the ever-friendly Herbert Bismarck, and of many others in the diplomatic service whom the rising man met at successive posts. There is little of the bitterness, the fault-finding, and the blaming of others which give such a disagreeable flavor to the first three volumes of his memoirs. Possibly in writing them he got some of the gall out of his system. In this fourth volume there are

no important political revelations, but on the psychological side there is much concerning Bülow, the rising diplomat which helps to explain Bülow the chancellor. S. B. F.

Professor L. Bergsträsser's *Geschichte der Politischen Parteien in Deutschland,* originally published in 1920, has reached a sixth edition, revised to bring it down to date (Mannheim, J. Bensheimer, 1932, pp. xii, 226, 3.60 M.).

The thesis that economic strength does not of necessity depend on political power receives further illustration from the monograph by Richard Behrendt, entitled *Die Schweiz und der Imperialismus; die Volkswirtschaft des Hochkapitalistischen Kleinstaates im Zeitalter des Politischen und Oekonomischen Nationalismus* (Zürich, Rascher, 1932, pp. 162).

Articles: P. Kehr, *Bericht über die Herausgabe der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 1931* (Sitzungsber. der Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften, XXVI., 1932); Herbert Meyer, *Bürgerfreiheit und Herrschergewalt unter Heinrich dem Löwen* (Hist. Zeitsch., Dec. 28); R. Koebner, *Deutsches Recht und Deutsche Kolonisation in den Piastenländern* (Vierteljahr. für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgesch., LII., 1932); H. Lemonnier, *L'Art Allemand au XV^e^ Siècle* [I., concl'd] (Jour. des Sav., Aug., Nov.); Wilhelm Joseph Meyer, *Bibliographie der Schweizergeschichte, Jahrgang 1931* (Beilage zur Zeitsch. für Schweizer Gesch., 1932); Martin Steinhäuser, *Karl Francke und Johann Gustav Droysen: ein Schleswig-Holsteinischer Briefwechsel, 1850–1860* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Jan.); Walter Frank, *Bernhard von Bülow* (Hist. Zeitsch., Dec. 28).

E. N. C.

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General review: Carlo Capasso, *Storia Medievale e Moderna* [14th and 15th centuries in Italy] (N. Antol., Dec. 1); Gioacchino Volpe, *Motivi e Aspetti della Presente Storiografia Italiana* (*ibid.*).

An important book for the history of Italy is *Gli Antichi Vescovi d'Italia dalle Origini al 1300 descritti per Regioni. La Lombardia,* vol. II., parte 2, *Cremona, Lodi, Mantova, Pavia* (Bergamo, Tip. S. Alessandro, 1932), by Fedele Savio.

The great work of A. Venturi, *Storia dell' Arte Italiana,* begun in 1901, has expanded to such a degree that it has been found necessary to issue vol. IX., dealing with *La Pittura del Cinquecento* in seven parts. Of these, part VI. is now available (Milan, Hoepli, 1933, pp. xl, 956).

The handsome volume published by Vito Vitale on *Onofrio Scassi e la Vita Genovese del suo Tempo, 1768–1836* (Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria, vol. LIX., Genoa, 1932, pp. vii, 390), uses the career of this physician and educator as a peg on which to hang a documented narrative of the com-

plicated transitions through which Genoa passed during and following the period of French control. Scassi, who introduced vaccination into Italy and was dean of the university, held various political and administrative offices under most of the rapidly changing régimes. Nevertheless he was a strong patriot and, though not a figure of the first rank, is regarded by the author as typical of the new intellectual bourgeoisie in his political and social attitude.

Luigi Minichini e la Carboneria a Nola, by M. Manfredi, is a study of the Neapolitan insurrection of 1820, based on police and diplomatic documents preserved in the Neapolitan archives [Studi e Documenti di Storia del Risorgimento, vol. VIII.] (Florence, Le Monnier, 1932, pp. 230).

To the series of Government Handbooks, edited by David P. Barrows and Thomas H. Reed has been added a volume entitled *Government and Politics of Italy,* by Henry Russell Spencer, professor of political science in the Ohio State University (World Book Company, 1932, pp. xi, 307, $1.60). After preliminary chapters on Geography, The People, Historical Background, the author examines every phase of the political and administrative life of Fascist Italy. There is a topical bibliography.

Articles: G. Pugliese Carratelli, *Gelone Principe Siracusano* [end of 5th and 6th centuries, I.] (Arch. Stor. per la Sicilia Orientale, XXVIII., fasc. I.); W. Cohn, *Storia della Flotta Siciliana sotto il Governo di Carlo I. d'Angiò* [III., 1272] (*ibid.*); Alfred Hessel, Walther Bulst, *Kardinal Guala Bichieri und seine Bibliothek* (Hist. Vierteljahr., Jan.); Mario Rossi, *L'Occupazione Napoletana di Rome, 1799–1801* (Rassegna Stor. del Risorgimento, July); Giacomo Lumbroso, *Austria e Toscana dopo la Restaurazione del 1849* (*ibid.*); Roberto Michels, *Quelques Aperçus sur l'Histoire de la Bourgeoisie Italienne an XIX^e Siècle* (Rev. Hist., Nov.).

Letters: Niccolò Rodolico, ed., *Lettere Inedite di Carlo Alberto e del Conte Federico Truchsess di Waldburg* [1822] (N. Antol., Feb. 1); Gaetano de Felice, ed., *Lettere Inedite di Benedetto XV. al Barone Carlo Monti, 1914–1921* (*ibid.*, Jan. 16).

E. N. C.

NORTHERN EUROPE

A bibliography of Norwegian history for 1930, prepared by Reidar Omang of the university library in Oslo, has been published in a recent issue of *Historisk Tidsskrift* (1932, 3). The compiler lists 3271 titles, some of which seem, however, to lie rather far out on the borderland of the subject.

A recent volume by Rudolf Björkegren entitled *När Gotland var Danskt Lydland* is a record based largely on manuscript sources of the course of events in the isle of Gotland while it was a possession of the Danish crown, or from approximately 1400 to 1645 when it was definitely transferred to Sweden (Visby, Norrberg, 1931).

Some fifty years ago a project was launched to publish the acts and decisions of the Swedish parliament and three volumes were published covering the years 1521–1597. Recently the project has been resumed and three parts have come from the press (*Svenska Riksdagsakter,* Stockholm, 1931–1932). The editors, Lars Sjödin and Nils Ahnlund, have dealt respectively with the years 1597–1598 and 1611–1616.

A parallel undertaking is in progress in Denmark where the government has arranged to publish a history of the Assembly of Estates which functioned as a parliament in the period 1830–1848. Hans Jensen has been appointed editor of the series and the first volume covering the first four sessions appeared in 1931 (*De Danske Stænderforsamlingers Historie,* Copenhagen, I. H. Schultz).

The new history of the Danish people which was planned and undertaken some years ago by Professor Erik Arup has now appeared in its second volume, in which the narrative is carried forward to 1624 (*Danmarks Historie,* Copenhagen, Hagerup, 1932.)

An important contribution to the history of Denmark and her great neighbor to the south is H. P. Hanssen's review of his public life of which the third volume came from the press a few months ago. The narrative begins with Hanssen's election to the German Reichstag in 1906 as representative of the Danish element in North Schleswig which position he occupied till 1919, when his constituency was restored to the Danish kingdom. The volume closes with the events of 1912 (*Et Tilbageblik,* Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1932).

The Stanford University Press has published an important contribution to the history of Norway and of the Great War in a monograph on *The Neutrality of Norway in the World War* by Paul J. Vigness (Stanford University, 1932).

Vol. XXII. of the annual publication *Islandica* is devoted to a study by the editor, Halldór Hermansson, in the career of *Saemund Sigfússon and the Oddverjar,* an Icelandic family of great renown in the North which flourished particularly in the twelfth century (Ithaca, University Library, 1932, pp. 52, $1).

Books I. and II., entitled *Lenin, toward the Seizure of Power: the Revolution of 1917, from the July Days to the October Revolution* (New York, International Publishers, 1932, 2 vols., pp. 304, 350, $3.50 each), form vol. XXI. of the *Collected Works.* The editor is Alexander Trachtenberg, and the translator Moissaye J. Olgin. The work does not include all that Lenin wrote during the period, because some of his letters are missing and articles contributed to the press have not all been identified. Certain of his longer essays are added, for example, The Threatening Catastrophe and How to

fight it, and State and Revolution. In order to make clear the background of his thought it has also been deemed necessary to print many documents, particularly the proceedings of the central committee of the Bolshevik party during the sessions of October 23 and 29.

Articles: H. Fiskaa, *Om Karl XII's Militære Planer straks efter Kampen paa Norderhov, 1716* [the military plans of Charles XII. immediately after the battle at Norderhov, 1716] (Historisk Tidsskrift, 1932, 2); Hermann Gummerus, *Die Finnen in Ingermanland* (Nordische Rundschau, 1932, 2); Carl Arvid Hessler, *Gustaf II. Adolfs Konungaförsäkran* [coronation charter of Gustavus II. Adolphus] (Scandia, 1932, 2); Wilhelm Keilhau, *Forspillet til Vetostriden i Norge* [events leading up to the conflict over the veto in Norway] (Nordiskt Tidskrift, 1932, 3); A. M. Tellgren, *Finland vid Slutet af Hednatiden* [Finland at the close of the heathen age] (Fornvännen, 1932); Elis Wadstein, *Hedeby* (*ibid.*).

L. M. L.

THE FAR EAST

The Chinese Cultural Society of New York City has published in two volumes the *Memoranda presented to the Lytton Commission,* edited by V. K. Wellington Koo, assessor (New York, the Society, 1932, pp. 940, $3.00). Another work, giving also the Chinese point of view on the question of Manchuria, is *Essays on the Manchurian Problem,* by Shuhsi Hsü, professor of political science in Yenching University (Shanghai, China Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1932, pp. xxii, 349). Still another, in this case sympathetic toward the Japanese policy is, *Le Drame de l'Extrême-Orient: la Mandchourie, Historique, Économique, son Avenir* (Paris, Payot, 1932, pp. 222, 15 fr.). The historical origins of this and cognate questions is considered in a volume entitled *The Capital Question of China,* by Lionel Curtis, formerly honorary secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs at Chatham House (Macmillan, 1932, pp. xix, 322, $3.00).

Article: Payson J. Treat, *The Good Offices of the United States during the Sino-Japanese War* (Pol. Sci. Quar., Dec.).

UNITED STATES

GENERAL

Among recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following may be noted: photocopies of diary of Samuel Vaughan, kept during a journey, 1787, Virginia to Pennsylvania; of papers of Senator Benjamin Tappan, chiefly of 1839–1845 (69 pieces); papers of Gales and Seaton (about 120 pieces); letters to Thurlow Weed, 1828–1884 (about 130); journals and diaries of Samuel P. Boyer, 1862–1869; 37 letters to Gen. Francis A. Walker on the silver question, from various persons, 1878–

1896; the papers of Senator Thomas H. Carter, several hundred in number; those of Judge John D. Caton (6500 pieces); and those of Admiral Dewey.

The *Report of the Librarian of Congress* for 1932 is of especial interest not only because of the record of important accessions of manuscripts made by Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, chief of the Division of Manuscripts, but also for Dr. Jameson's review of the project, supported by the munificent gifts of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, jr., which carried forward for five years the reproductions of manuscript materials for American history preserved in foreign archives and libraries. The *Report* also contains a description by Dr. Worthington C. Ford, director of the European mission of the library, of what was done during the final year of the grant, which ended on August 31, 1932.

Through the wise and patriotic foresight of the Washington Association of New Jersey, and especially of Mr. Lloyd W. Smith of Madison, the United States has become the possessor of a new national park, styled the Morristown National Historical Park. The places of greatest interest are the Ford House, which was occupied by Washington during a large part of his stay at Morristown, Jockey Hollow, the camp site of the Continental Army, and Fort Nonsense Park, the position of one of the defenses of the encampment. Ford House has belonged to the Washington Association for many years and within its walls is assembled a large collection of relics of Washington and of the period. The Jockey Hollow area of more than a thousand acres, most of which was purchased by Mr. Smith in order to preserve it in its original condition, free from the danger of real estate subdivisions, still shows marks of the huts of the Revolutionary soldiers. All these elements of the proposed park were offered to the United States as a gift, and a bill was passed by the 72nd Congress to accept the gift. The park will be under the control of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

As the Catholic University of America has created within the department of history the division of American Church history under the direction of Dr. Peter Guilday it is appropriate that no. 1 of the American Church History Seminar Bulletins should be *Dissertations in American Church History (1889–1932)*, showing what has already been accomplished in this special field.

The List of Business Manuscripts in the Baker Library, compiled by Margaret Ronzone Cusick (Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, 1932, pp. vii, 112, 50 cents) should further the movement in this country to preserve the records of agriculture, industry, and trade. The compiler remarks that the first set of records to be acquired by the library was the collection of business papers of Samuel Slater and his associate. The catalogue list opens with agriculture. It is natural that in the section on Marine Industries whaling and vessels hailing from New Bedford and Nan-

tucket should have a prominent place. The sections on Manufacturing and Marketing Services have the largest number of entries.

The Huntington Library has published a fascimile of one of its most interesting possessions, *Washington's Map of Mount Vernon,* with an introduction by Lawrence Martin, chief of the Division of Maps, *Library of Congress* (University of Chicago Press, 25 cents). Colonel Martin says that the "Huntington Library map is considered to be the oldest of the half-dozen possible versions by Washington and the only one of them that is known to have been preserved". The date of the map is 1793, and the facsmile is full-scale.

Planning and Building the City of Washington (Washington, Ransdell, 1932, pp. xviii, 258, $2.00) is edited by Frederick Haynes Newell for the Washington Society of Engineers and endorsed by the George Washington Bicentennial Commission. The various chapters—on such topics as Federal Buildings, Parks and Monuments, Bridges, Public Utilities—are contributed by engineers and architects, and tell in straightforward, non-technical way the development of the capital city from an engineering standpoint but with emphasis on the early plans and work of General Washington.

The American Doctrine of Judicial Supremacy, by Charles Grove Haines, Ph.D., has appeared in a second edition, revised and enlarged [Publications of the University of California at Los Angeles in Social Sciences, vol. I.] (University of California Press, 1932, pp. xviii, 705, $6.00.) The first edition was printed in 1914.

Thorstein Veblen: a Chapter in American Economic Thought, by Richard Victor Teggart, forms the first part of vol. XI. of the University of California Publications in Economics (1932, pp. vii, 126, $1.75).

In vol. XXX. of the *Journal* of the American Irish Historical Society for 1932, besides the reports and proceedings, are several essays which throw light upon the migration and local influence of the Irish. Among these are The Irish in Texas, by Bernadine Rice; Philadelphia Irish, by J. Dominick Hackett; and Irish Migrations to America, by George O'Dwyer.

The latest number of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* [labeled "April 1932" on the cover and "January, 1932" on the first page] is principally devoted to items pertaining to Washington. Among these is a paper by Dr. S. C. Williams on the First Territorial Division Named for Washington; another, by Dr. W. A. Provine, on Washington College, the First Educational Institution Named for the President; a third is a descriptive account by Dr. Provine of Washington's Old Mill Book, in possession of the Tennessee Historical Society; and a fourth is a reprint from a Nashville paper of the celebration of the Washington anniversary in that city in 1832.

Articles: R. Walton Moore, *General Washington and Houdon* (Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Jan.); A. R. Newsome, *The Washington Portrait in the House of Representatives* [historical sketch] (North Carolina Hist. and Biog. Record, Jan.); David Y. Thomas, *How Washington dealt with Discontent* (South Atlantic Quar., Jan.); Harold A. Larrabee, *A Neglected French Collaborator in the Victory of Yorktown: Claude-Anne Marquis de Saint-Simon 1740–1819* (Jour. des Américanistes, XXIV, fasc. 2); John W. Wright, *Notes on the Siege of Yorktown in 1781, with Special Reference to the Conduct of a Siege in the Eighteenth Century* (William and Mary College Quar. Hist. Mag., Oct.); Lyon G. Tyler, *Arthur Lee, a Neglected Statesman,* [cont'd] (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Jan.); Everett D. Obrecht, *Influence of Luther Martin in the Making of the Constitution of the United States,* [concl'd] (Maryland Hist. Mag., Dec.); Marie Kimball, *The Epicure of the White House* [Thomas Jefferson] (Virginia Quar. Rev., Jan.); E. I. McCormac, *Justice Campbell and the Dred Scott Decision* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Mar.); Richard R. Stenberg, *Some Political Aspects of the Dred Scott Case* (*ibid.*); Laura A. White, *The United States in the 1850's as seen by British Consuls* (*ibid.*); T. D. Clark, *The Lexington and Ohio Railroad: a Pioneer Venture* (Register of the Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Jan.); Ralph Shipp, *Frontier and American Political Life* (The Aerend, fall, 1932); Julius F. Prufer, *A Chart showing the Development of Minor Parties in the United States, 1776–1932* (Hist. Outlook, Feb.); William J. Hoffman, *An Armory of American Families of Dutch Descent* (New York Geneal. and Biog. Record, Jan.); Charles P. Summerall, *Huguenot Descendants in the Revolutionary War* (Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina, no. 37); Ray A. Billington, *Tentative Bibliography of the Anti-Catholic Propaganda in the United States, 1800–1860* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Jan.); Mary R. Beard, *Lucretia Mott* (American Scholar, Jan.); George Leibbrandt, *The Emigration of the German Mennonites from Russia to the United States and Canada in 1873–1880* [I.] (Mennonite Quar. Rev., Oct.); Russell J. Ferguson, *The Lure of Pioneering in Historical Research* (Miss. Valley Hist. Rev., Mar.).

Documents and letters: *Transportations of Felons to the Colonies* [memorials, advertisements, etc.] (Maryland Hist. Mag., Dec.); *The Deputy Adjutant General's Orderly Book, Ticonderoga, 1776* [kept by John Trumbull, from July 10 to Aug. 31] (Bull. of the Ticonderoga Museum, Jan.); A. R. Newsome, ed., *A British Orderly Book, 1780–1781* [concl'd] (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Oct.); Victor Hugo Paltsits, ed., *A Naval Letter Book of the American Revolution: an Official Record of the Navy Board of the Eastern District, sitting at Boston* (Bull. N. Y. Public Library, Dec.); Mary Salesia Godecker, ed., *Correspondence on Indian Removal, 1835–1838* (Mid-America, Jan.); *Diaries of Judge David McDonald* [visits to Washington:

winter, 1858–1859; summer 1862; Sept. and Dec., 1864] (Indiana Mag. of Hist., Dec.); Mrs. Frederick L. Hamil, ed., *From Central Illinois to the Shenandoah Valley in 1843: the Journal of John Edward Young* (Jour. of the Illinois State Hist. Soc., Oct.); Joseph W. Ellison, ed., *Diary of Maria Parsons Belshaw, 1853* [journey from Lake County, Indiana, to Oregon] (Oregon Hist. Quar., Dec.); Thomas Ewing, ed., *Lincoln and the General Land Office, 1849* [correspondence relative to the appointment of a commissioner] (Jour. of the Illinois State Hist. Soc., Oct.).

NEW ENGLAND

With the beginning of a new volume the publication dates of the *New England Quarterly* will be the fifteenth of March, June, September, and December. As a supplement the *Quarterly* has published *A Short Account of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, 1917–1919,* by Augustus Peabody Loring. The first three sections deal with the old constitution and the reform movement which led to the calling of a convention. A minor fact illustrative of the change in conditions in Massachusetts is the number of farmers chosen as delegates, four as against 124 chosen to the convention of 1853. At the same time the number of lawyers had risen from seventy-seven to 157.

Vol. LXIV. of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston, the Society, 1932, pp. xvi, 570) is unusually rich in many-sided interest. Included among its memoirs are Samuel Eliot Morison's account, full of reminiscence and suggestive interpretation, of Edward Channing's career, and Roger Bigelow Merriman's sketch of the achievements of Archibald Cary Coolidge. Professor Ephraim Emerton also contributes a memoir upon President Eliot. An essay which will delight and console many who have become a little weary of the pretensions of certain recent types of biography and history is Some "New" History and Historians, by Wilbur Cortez Abbott. Professor A. M. Schlesinger is the author of an essay on A Critical Period in American Religion, 1875–1900.

An interesting section of the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society, recently issued, is the report of the librarian, Mr. R. G. W. Vail, which touches every phase of the society's collections. During the past year a successful effort has been made to add to the newspaper and periodical files. One of two rare Lowell papers obtained is the *Middlesex Standard,* edited by Whittier. For the earlier period the most important accessions were items completing the file of the *Pennsylvania Magazine,* 1775–1776, edited by Tom Paine. It was in this magazine that took place the first periodical publication of the Declaration of Independence. Under the head of "The Mathers", Mr. Vail explains that in first editions and in editions published

during Increase Mather's lifetime the society's collection is tied with that in the library of Mr. W. G. Mather, of Cleveland, while it is ahead of that library and of the Boston Public Library in the possession of titles in any edition.

To the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society for April, 1932, Professor Evarts B. Greene contributes, under the title A Puritan Counter-Reformation, an illuminating parallel between the Catholic Counter-Reformation of the sixteenth century, and the movements—educational, expansive, missionary—by which in the first half of the nineteenth century New England orthodoxy responded to the encroachments and dominance of the Unitarian wing of New England's principal religious body. One hundred and fourteen pages are devoted to a bibliography of Mrs. Susannah Rowson.

For the past year or two the Essex Institute has been obtaining copies of the early records of entry and clearance at Massachusetts ports (1686-1815), which are preserved in the Public Record Office in London, and which comprise quarterly returns made by naval officers stationed in the colony. These returns give information as to the names of vessels and masters, and as to the cargoes. From the middle of the eighteenth century they also give the names of owners and the place and date of building of each vessel. These shipping records, considered of great value, have been offered in photostatic copies to various large libraries, and two installments of about 500 pages have already been distributed.

Among other important accessions to the collections of the Institute are the Salem Custom House records and files, which have been transferred from the Custom House on Derby Street. There are on deposit now the records of all the Essex County ports, Salem, Beverly, Marblehead, Gloucester, and Newburyport. The Institute has also received the early account books of John Smith and Company of Andover, 1822–1854; shipping papers of the Henry Larcom family; account books of the Manning Stage business of Salem, 1785–1803; 220 photostats of Whittier letters, with more than a thousand letters written to Whittier; a collection of autograph letters of Mary Abigail Dodge, Lucy Larcom, and Harriet Prescott Spofford; and the Civil War correspondence of General Nathaniel P. Banks.

The Manchester, New Hampshire, Historic Association opened its new building on October 21. This building was the gift of the president of the association, Mr. Frank P. Carpenter. To it were transferred the collections formerly in the Carpenter Memorial Library.

Articles: P. A. Scholes, *The Truth about the New England Puritans and Music* (Musical Quar., Jan.); Hervey P. Prentiss, *Timothy Pickering and the Federalist Party, 1801–1804* (Essex Institute Hist. Coll., Jan.).

Letters: E. Clowes Chorley, ed., *Letters of the Reverend Doctor Jeremiah Leaming to the Reverend Doctor Samuel Peters, Loyalist Refugee in London,*

and One Time Bishop-Elect of Vermont [from the Jarvis Papers] (Hist. Mag. of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Dec.); Rufus Choate, *Letters* [1831, 1834] (*ibid.*).

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

In the December number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* appears the first part of a study, by Russell H. Anderson, of the readjustments of agriculture in New York in the period from 1830 to 1850 necessitated by western competition. The paper is entitled New York Agriculture Meets the West.

The History of Shelter Island is traced with affectionate care by Mr. Ralph G. Duval, one of its citizens. He describes the first settlement in 1652, and gives accounts of the principal families which eventually took up their residence on the island. How these communities were affected by the development of colonial and national life is the principal theme. The volume is illustrated, but a good map of the region might well have been added.

The Anniversary of New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1680–1730–1930 is a record of the Anniversary Celebration of the city of New Brunswick in October, 1930, compiled by William H. S. Demarest, who was chairman of the committee of arrangements. It gives a full account of what was done and embodies what was said. The volume is handsomely printed and well illustrated.

The *Indians of South New Jersey* is the subject of the third publication of the Gloucester County Historical Society. It contains much information on relics, trails, language, and deeds, with copies of several of these documents, in essays by the president of the society, Frank H. Stewart, and by Charles A. Philhower and Dorothy E. Middleton.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has received from Miss Maria Dickinson Logan a noteworthy manuscript collection containing 611 items, among them a letter from William Penn to James Logan (1705), two commissions from Penn to Logan, the first dated May 26, 1701, and the second October 29, 1701, letters from Benjamin Franklin, John Hancock, John Jay, Caesar Rodney, John Dickinson, and Thomas Jefferson. There is a document signed by Hannah Penn in 1724, another signed the year previous by Springett Penn, and a petition, with many signatures, to make Chester a free port. Another accession is a collection of twelve pieces relating to the settlement of Benjamin Franklin's estate. The society has also received a collection of letters by and about Philadelphians (1781–1822), some of which were written from Paris in 1781 and 1782 and contain many references to Franklin. A gift from Thomas Chalkley Matlack consists of eight volumes of photographs and descriptions of old Friends' meeting houses in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

The autumn issue of the *Bulletin* of the Friends' Historical Association of Philadelphia is called the *William Penn Anniversary Number.* Several of the papers included were read at the summer meeting of the association held at Chester last May in observance of William Penn's first arrival. The opening paper, by Dr. Albert Cook Myers, dealt with Robert Wade, the Earliest Quaker Settler on the West Side of the Delaware River in 1676, and the First American Host of William Penn.

The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania has issued (multigraphed) as Bibliographical Contributions, no. 1, an Inventory of the Manuscript and Miscellaneous Collections in its possession. The society is making a canvass of the older commercial and industrial establishments of Pittsburgh, in order to salvage early business records. It is also presenting a series of monthly historical broadcasts from a local radio station. Among recent additions to the collections is a rare, if not unique, file of an early Pittsburgh newspaper, the *Allegheny Democrat,* 1833–1836.

Articles: Carlos E. Godfrey, *When Boston was New Jersey's Capital* (Proceedings of the New Jersey Hist. Soc., Jan.); Beatrice Pastorius Turner, *William Penn and Pastorius* (Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Jan.); Robert J. Hunter, *The Origin of the Philadelphia General Hospital* (*ibid.*); Alfred P. James, *William Pitt and Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh Record, Jan.).

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Human Geography of the South: a Study in Regional Resources and Human Adequacy, by Rupert B. Vance, research associate in the University of North Carolina (University of North Carolina Press, 1932, pp. xiv, 596, $4.00), describes the soil, topography, climate, and historical background of the South as well as the diet and the diseases peculiar to this region and the relation of all these factors to human life in the South. The work might be described as a humanized physical and economic geography: a study of the effect of the region on its people. Without losing sight of the essential unity of the whole southern region, the author describes separately both the economic system and the distinctive culture built upon it in such sub-regions as the cotton belt, the piney-woods, the tobacco region, the highlands, and the sugar bowl. A large body of facts drawn from the findings in many fields of knowledge—the bibliography covers sixty-seven pages—gives the work an authoritative tone. Not content with showing how environment has molded Southern civilization, Dr. Vance, believing that man can remake the map, expresses criticisms of many present practices and suggests improvements. He concludes with a plea for an intelligent reconstruction of habits and methods so that the resources of the South may serve more adequately its population. The work will be of value to students of recent Southern move-

ments, and to those as well who wield political and economic power over the South. C. S. S.

To the series of historical documents printed under the auspices of the Institut Français of Washington, Professor Gilbert Chinard has added an edition of a volume originally published at The Hague in 1687 entitled *Un Français en Virginie: Voyages d'un Français exilé pour la Religion, avec une Description de la Virginie & Marilan dans l'Amérique* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, pp. 158, $2.50). Professor Chinard in his illuminating introduction tells us what is known or conjectured of the author, presumably a nobleman of Provence of the Durand family. The story of the escape from France after the Revocation and of Monsieur Durand's journeys until he eventually reached Virginia is interesting, but the value of the publication lies in the sections describing Virginia, because this is the only seventeenth century account which we have written by a foreigner. A partial translation was privately printed ten years ago under the title of *A Frenchman in Virginia, Being the Memoirs of a Huguenot Refugee in 1686,* and Baird's *History of the Huguenot Emigration in America* made some use of the material, but we are fortunate now to possess the original text, in a handsome edition furnished with plates illustrating Virginia life.

Among the recent accessions to the collections of the North Carolina Historical Commission is a copy of an exceedingly rare newspaper, the Edenton *Intelligencer,* April 9, 1788, and three account books of John Hogg and Company, Hillsborough and Wilmington, 1798–1805.

To record the peculiarities of a dialect which is rapidly suffering great change, the Institut Français of Washington has published a volume entitled *Les Acadiens Louisianais et leur Parler* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, pp. 272, $2.50). The book is an edition by Jay K. Ditchy, of Tulane University, of an anonymus manuscript completed in 1901 after years of patient work, and now in the Historical Museum of Louisiana. Besides the sections on Grammaire and Glossaire, the unknown author includes in his study a brief account of the history and folklore of the Acadiens Louisianais.

From Morfi's cumbersome *Memorias* (the notes gathered in preparation for his *Historias de la Provincia de Texas,* soon to be published by Mr. Carlos E. Castañeda), Mr. Frederick C. Chabot makes available with translation, a prologue, appendix, and notes, the parts dealing with the Indians of Texas (*Excerpts from the Memorias for the History of the Province of Texas by Padre Fray Juan Agustin de Morfi,* San Antonio, privately published, 1932, pp. xxii, 85). Book I. treats of tribal divisions, numbers, and location, Book II. of culture traits, Book III. of mission establishments. This concise and vivid portrayal of the Indians' status as of 1779 is enhanced by abundant and scholarly annotation and the prologue reviews the development of Spanish Texas with emphasis upon the 1770s. Sumptuously illustrated, printed in

folio, with double columns, and bound in fabricoid with overlapping cover and tie-thongs to simulate eighteenth century format, the book will grace any library. J. C.

Articles: Henry F. Pringle, *Theodore Roosevelt and the South* (Virginia Quar. Rev., Jan.); Samuel Eliot Morison, *Virginians and Marylanders at Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (William and Mary Coll. Hist. Quar., Jan.); William J. Hinke, *The 1714 Colony of Germanna, Virginia* [concl'd] (Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Jan.); G. MacLaren Brydon, *The Clergy of the Established Church in Virginia and the Revolution* (*ibid.*); W. Neil Franklin, *Virginia and the Cherokee Indian Trade, 1753–1775* (East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Publications, Jan.); G. G. Johnson, *Revival Movements in Ante-Bellum North Carolina* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Jan.); B. U. Ratchford, *The North Carolina Public Debt, 1870–1878* (*ibid.*); Lester J. Cappon, *Iron-Making: a Forgotten Industry of North Carolina* (*ibid.*, Oct.); Edgar L. Pennington, *Anglican Influences in the Establishment of Georgia* (Georgia Hist. Quar., Dec.); Amanda Johnson, *Georgia: from Colony to Commonwealth, 1774–1777* (*ibid.*); William E. Heath, *The Yazoo Land Fraud* (*ibid.*); Edgar Legare Pennington, *Beginnings of the Church of England in Georgia* (Hist. Mag. of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Dec.); Wilbur H. Siebert, *How the Spaniards evacuated Pensacola in 1763* (Florida Hist. Soc. Quar., Oct.); Lane C. Kendall, *John McDonough, Slave Owner* [II.] (Louisiana Hist. Quar., Jan.); John Caughey, *The Natchez Rebellion of 1781 and its Aftermath* (*ibid.*); W. D. Overdyke, *History of the American Party in Louisiana* [II.] (*ibid.*); Edwin L. Stephens, *Education in Louisiana in the Closing Decades of the Nineteenth Century* (*ibid.*).

Documents, papers, letters: *Letters from Lawrence Butler* [1788–1791] [cont'd] (Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Jan.); *War Letters* (Tyler's Quar. Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Jan.); A. R. Newsome, ed., *Letters of Lawrence O'Bryan Branch, 1856–1861* (North Carolina Hist. Rev., Jan.); Mabel L. Webber, ed., *Josiah Smith's Diary, 1780–1781* [cont'd] (South Carolina Hist. and Geneal. Mag., Jan.); J. G. Dunlop, ed., *William Dunlop's Mission to St. Augustine in 1688* [journal and papers] (*ibid.*); Winnie Allen, ed., *The Autobiography of George W. Smyth* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Jan.); Harriet Smither, ed., *Diary of Adolphus Sterne* (*ibid.*).

WESTERN STATES

Kentucky Court and Other Records, vol. II., compiled and published by Julia S. Ardery, Paris, Kentucky, is announced.

The Ohio State Department of Highways in relocating certain bridges along the old National Road is endeavoring to preserve the earlier structures, especially the "S" bridges, as historical monuments.

The Historical Bureau of Indiana has published the *Indiana Book of Merit: Official Individual Decorations and Commendations awarded to Indiana Men and Women for Services in the World War.* It has been compiled by Harry A. Rider, and is vol. IV. of the *Indiana World War Records* (Indianapolis, Historical Bureau, 1932, pp. xi, 827, $5.00).

The *Indiana History Bulletin* for October is devoted to The Archaeology of Porter County, by J. Gilbert McAllister. The excavations of two mounds (Vergin and Weise) are especially considered. There is a section on Artifacts from Mounds. The essay is abundantly illustrated with maps, drawings, and plates.

The October number of the *Journal* of the Illinois State Historical Society contains a series of five articles, from various hands respecting the late Charles Henry Rammelkamp (1874–1932), president for twenty-seven years of Illinois College. One of these five is concerning Dr. Rammelkamp's historical contributions and interests and is by Professor Clarence E. Carter.

Dr. Grace Raymond Hebard's *The Pathbreakers from River to Ocean: the Story of the Great West from the Time of Coronado to the Present,* has been published in a sixth edition, revised and enlarged (Glendale, Arthur H. Clark, 1933, pp. viii, 312, $2.50). This edition is fully illustrated, a number of the pictures reproducing historical paintings and sketches by William H. Jackson to illustrate scenes on the Oregon Trail. Mr. Jackson accompanied the Hayden United States Geological Survey in 1870.

The State University of Iowa has recently acquired a large collection of material concerning the history of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad and the Union Pacific Railroad. This material consists of reports, articles of incorporation, pamphlets and circulars, manuscripts, letters, lists of stockholders, newspaper clippings, cancelled checks, reminiscences, and pictures. The collection was made by Mr. L. O. Leonard of Whiting, Indiana, a son of Nathan R. Leonard, formerly a member of the faculty of the State University. Mr. Leonard has been connected with the railroads for over fifty years, and for twenty years he has been collecting historical material relating to the railroads. The collection will be classified and indexed, and after an interval of four years will be available for the use of students.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has recently received 280 Schurz letters. They were given by Mrs. Frances Hellman, of New York, to whom they were written in connection with her work on a translation of Heine's poems. The material in regard to the Indians, noted in the January number of the *Review,* concerned the "Stockbridge", rather than the "Brothertown", Indians. In the same number the article on the late Carl Russell Fish should have been credited to Dr. Louise P. Kellogg.

State-wide Historical Planning was the subject of the discussion of the

thirteenth annual conference on local historical work in Minnesota, which was held in connection with the Minnesota Historical Society's annual meeting on January 16. Chief among the planks in the suggested program of statewide historical activity were the establishment of a county newspaper collection, the preservation and organization of county archives, the collection and preservation of church records, and a survey of historic sites and monuments. Among the leaders of the discussion were Dr. Theodore C. Blegen, superintendent of the Minnesota Historical Society and Dr. Grace Lee Nute, curator of manuscripts for the society.

The annual address at the annual meeting was delivered by Professor A. C. Krey on the subject History in the Machine Age. The new president of the society is Mr. William W. Cutler, of St. Paul. He succeeds Dean Guy Stanton Ford.

Salient periods of Minnesota history since the Civil War have been described in a series of weekly radio talks presented under the auspices of the Minnesota Historical Society over station WLB at the University of Minnesota. The subjects included among others: The Days of the Civil War, by Dr. Theodore C. Blegen, superintendent of the society; The Sioux Outbreak, and New Settlers and the Westward Push, both by Willoughby M. Babcock, curator of the museum; The Golden Age of Lumbering, by Agnes M. Larson, St. Olaf College, Northfield; and The Flour Milling Industry, by Dr. C. B. Kuhlmann, Hamline University.

Among the recent accessions to the society's collections are a file of the *Folkebladet,* a Norwegian newspaper of Minneapolis, and additions to the papers of the late James A. Tawney. A beginning has also been made of a collection depicting life in a typical lumber camp.

The work of that amazingly vigorous Jesuit missionary, Father Kino, the "apostle to the Pimas", is told in brief form by Herbert Eugene Bolton in *The Padre on Horseback* (San Francisco, the Sonora Press, 1932, pp. 90, $2.00). The biography, in substance, was given in an address by Mr. Bolton at the Kino celebration at Tucson in March, 1932; the materials for it were based primarily on Father Kino's own history of the little mission at Dolores, recently discovered in the archives of Mexico. The story reveals Father Kino, not only as a missionary, but also as rancher, explorer, and cartographer, of Pimería Alta between 1687 and 1711.

A sympathetic and interesting account of the Osage Indians when their culture was as yet almost untouched by that of the white man, is told by John Joseph Mathews, himself a member of the Osage tribe, in *Wah'Kon-Tah: the Osage and the White Man's Road* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1932, pp. 359, $2.50). The story centers around Major Laban J. Miles, who went as agent to the Osages in 1878, and takes the form, not of conventional-

ized history of his experiences, but of narration of incidents, descriptions, conversations based on Major Miles's notes. The author seems thus to have made available to the reader an appreciation not only of the perplexities and tragedies the Indian suffered when first confronted with the white man's culture, but also much of the beauty and dignity of a vanished civilization.

Mr. J. Neilson Barry, secretary of the Trail Seekers Council, Greenhills, R. F. D. 5, Oregon, desires information in regard to an alleged journey of one Lasalle or Lavalle, who was wrecked in 1809 in the ship *Sea Otter* on the Pacific Coast, and who with three other men crossed the continent to the head of Red River, Louisiana. Henry R. Schoolcraft in a letter to George Gibbs, printed in the Portland *Oregonian* of Dec. 25, 1852, said that he had Lasalle's journal in his possession. A Norfolk (Virginia) newspaper under date of June 20, 1810, seems to have reported the arrival of the man.

Washington Constitutional Convention Proceedings have been edited by Professor Edmond S. Meany (Seattle, Frank McCaffrey, $10.00).

The Serpent in Kwakiutl Religion: a Study in Primitive Culture, by Dr. G. W. Locher (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1932, pp. viii, 118) is based upon the study of abundant materials touching the customs and ideas of the Indians of northwest America. It is provided with a bibliography.

Articles: Charles B. Roberts, *The Building of Middlesborough* (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Jan.); Robert L. Shurter, *The Camp Meeting in the Early Life and Literature of the Mid-West* (East Tennessee Hist. Soc. Publications, Jan.); S. J. Folmsbee, *The Beginnings of the Railroad Movement in East Tennessee* (*ibid.*); Harvey W. Compton, *The Beginnings of Ohio Cities* (Quar. Bull. of the Historical Society of Northwestern Ohio, Jan.); Gilbert J. Garraghan, *Bishop Bruté of Vincennes, 1779–1839* (Mid-America, Jan.); Dorothy Riker, *Jonathan Jennings* [first governor of Indiana] (Indiana Mag. of Hist., Dec.); Thomas O. Mabbott and Philip D. Jordan, *The Prairie Chicken* [newspaper]: *Notes on Lincoln and Mrs. Kirkland* (Jour. of the Illinois State Hist. Soc., Oct.); Robert L. Ramsay, *The Study of Missouri Place-Names at the University of Missouri* (Missouri Hist. Rev., Jan.); Wilfred B. Shaw, *Early Days of the University of Michigan* [II.] (Michigan Hist. Mag., winter number); A. S. Badger, *Experiences of a Pioneer Minister* (*ibid.*); William J. Petersen, *Historical Setting of the Mound Region in Northeastern Iowa* (Iowa Jour. of Hist. and Pol., Jan.); James H. Lees, *The Geology and Topography of Northeastern Iowa* (*ibid.*); J. H. A. Lacher, *Nashotah House, Wisconsin's Oldest School of Higher Learning* (Wisconsin Hist. Mag., Dec.); Agnes M. Larson, *On the Trail of the Woodsman in Minnesota* (Minnesota Hist., Dec.); G. Hubert Smith, *The Winona Legend* (*ibid.*); Willoughby M. Babcock, *Highways and History* (*ibid.*); Robert L. Fisher, *The Treaties of Portage des Sioux* (Miss. Valley Hist Rev.,

Mar.); C. C. Rister, *Outlaws and Vigilantes of the Southern Plains, 1865–1885* (*ibid.*); Walter D. Wyman, *The Military Phase of Santa Fe Freighting, 1846–1865* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Nov.); Samuel A. Johnson, *The Emigrant Aid Company in Kansas* (*ibid.*); Marvin H. Garfield, *Defense of the Kansas Frontier, 1868–1869* (*ibid.*); John Haumont, *Pioneer Years in Custer County* (Nebraska Hist. Mag., Oct.); Henry Allen Brainerd, *Nebraska's Press History* (*ibid.*); Herbert S. Schell, *Official Immigration Activities of Dakota Territory* (North Dakota Hist. Quar., Oct.); Joseph O. Van Hook, *Development of Irrigation in the Arkansas Valley* (Colorado Mag., Jan.); LeRoy R. Hafen, *Louis Vasquez* [1798–1868] (*ibid.*); Lansing B. Bloom, [*John Gregory*] *Bourke* [*1846–1896*] *on the Southwest* (New Mexico Hist. Rev., Jan.); Charles Amsden, *The Navaho Exile at Bosque Redondo* (*ibid.*); Rufus Kay Wyllys, *Kino of Pimería Alta; Apostle of the Southwest* [cont'd] (Arizona Hist. Rev., Jan.); Will C. Barnes, *Arizona Place-Names* [excerpt from forthcoming book] (*ibid.*); James M. Barney, *Phoenix: A History of its Pioneer Days and People* [chs. I.-IV.] (*ibid.*); W. Clement Eaton, *Frontier Life in Southern Arizona, 1858–1861* (Southwestern Hist. Quar., Jan.); Grant Foreman, *Salt Works in Early Oklahoma* (Chron. of Oklahoma, Dec.); Hubert E. Collins, *Ben Williams, Frontier Peace Officer* (*ibid.*); Charles N. Reynolds, *Portland Public Schools, 1845–1871* (Oregon Hist. Quar., Dec.); Philip H. Overmeyer, *Nathaniel Jarvis Wyeth* [*1802–1856*]: *His First Expedition* (Washington Hist. Quar., Jan.); William S. Clark, *Pioneer Experience in Walla Walla* (*ibid.*).

Documents and letters: J. T. Dorris, ed., *Letter* [*April 27, 1839*] *of Col. Nathaniel Hart on the Claims of Boonesboro as the First Place of Settlement in Kentucky* (Register of the Kentucky State Hist. Soc., Jan.); Ludie J. Kinkhead and Katharine G. Healy, *Calendar of Bond and Power of Attorney Book No. 1, Jefferson County, Kentucky, 1783–1798* [I.] (Filson Club Hist. Quar., Jan.); George P. Street, contributor, *A Trip to Kentucky: Diary of Ira I. Ellis, May-June, 1819* (Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biog., Jan.); Samuel C. Williams, ed., *The Executive Journal of Governor John Sevier* (East Tennessee Hist. Society's Publications, Jan.); *Letters of J. W. Denison* [1855–1856, to Providence Western Land Company relative to purchase of Iowa lands] (Iowa Jour. of Hist. and Politics, Jan.); *Diary of Samuel A. Kingman at Indian Treaty in 1865* (Kansas Hist. Quar., Nov.); W. H. Jackson, *Diary: The Steam Wagon Road, 1866–1932* (Nebraska Hist. Mag., July); Arthur J. Larsen, ed., *A Journey to the Black Hills in 1880* [letters of George S. Pelton to the *Red River Valley News*] (North Dakota Hist. Quar., Oct.); Alfred B. Thomas, ed., *A Description of Sonora in 1772* [translation] (Arizona Hist. Rev., Jan.); J. Neilson Barry, ed., *Peter Corney's Voyages, 1814–1817* [excerpts from Corney's narrative] (Oregon Hist. Quar., Dec.); Nellie B. Pipes, *Spalding Mission, 1843* [letter

of Rev. Henry H. Spalding] (*ibid.*); Cyrus Shepard, *Early Letter from the Methodist Mission* [Vancouver, Jan. 10, 1835] (Washington Hist. Quar., Jan.).

CANADA

A Summer School of Historical Research is to be held at Ottawa, July 3-August 18, under the auspices of Queen's University. It will be concerned primarily with the problems of Canadian history and will be conducted by Professor Reginald G. Trotter.

Dr. John Clarence Webster has published another of his interesting studies on Nova Scotia under the title of *The Career of the Abbé Le Loutre in Nova Scotia, with a Translation of his Autobiography* (Shediac, N. B., privately printed, 1933).

Articles: Pierre-Georges Roy, *La Paroisse et l'Habitant Canadien sous le Régime Français* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Jan.); Patrick J. Lomasney, *The Canadian Jesuits and the Fur Trade* (Mid-America, Jan.); James F. Kenney, *Relations between Church and State in Canada since the Cession of 1763* (Catholic Hist. Rev., Jan.); W. S. Wallace, *The Pedlars from Quebec* (Canadian Hist. Rev., Dec.); William Menzies Whitelaw, *Responsible Government and the Irresponsible Governor* (*ibid.*); Donald C. Masters, *Reciprocity and the Genesis of a Canadian Commercial Policy* (*ibid.*); Marius Barbeau, *Asiatic Migrations into America* (*ibid.*); A. R. M. Lower, *The Growth of Canada's Population in Recent Years* (*ibid*).

CUBA, MEXICO, AND SOUTH AMERICA

The Eighth Seminar held in Mexico under the auspices of the Committee on Cultural Relations with Latin America meets from July 8 to July 28 in Cuernavaca and Mexico City. Among the leaders of groups for discussion are Dr. Charles W. Hackett, Dr. Sylvanus Morley, and Dr. Chester Lloyd Jones. Further information may be had from Mr. Hubert C. Herring, 112 East 19th St., New York City.

No. 38 of the Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano by Joaquín Ramírez Cabañas is entitled *Altamirano y el Baron de Wagner:un Incidente Diplomático en 1862* (Mexico, 1932).

No 25 of Monografías Bibliográficos Mexicanos by Jesús Romero Flores is entitled *Apuntes para una Bibliografía Geográfica é Histórica de Michoacán* (Mexico, 1932). No. 26 of the same series by Luis Chaves Orozce bears the title *Bibliografía de Zacatecas* (Mexico, 1932).

Among other items, no. 37 of the *Boletín de la Biblioteca Nacional* of Venezuela contains materials on the Diary of Bucaramanga and the death of Simón Bolívar.

Besides other items, nos. 224–225 of the *Boletín de Historia y Antigüedades* (Sept., Oct., 1932) of the Colombian Academy of History contain articles on the following topics: Jiménez de Quesada and the conquest of New Granada, and the campaign of Governor Pimienta of Cartagena in 1700 against the Scots' Darien colony.

Under the auspices of the Pan American Union, and as no. 9 of its bibliographic series, Dr. A. Curtis Wilgus, of George Washington University, has published (mimeographed) *The Histories of Hispanic America: a Bibliographical Essay.*

Articles: José Torre Rebello, *Origen y Aplicación del Código Negrere en la América Española (1788–1791)* (Boletín del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, no. 53); A. M. Ibañez, *Echevarría en Relación con las Tendencias Unitaries y Federales* (*ibid.*); "F. R.", *Aclaraciones sobre le Vida y Muerte de Rosas en el Destierro* (*ibid.*); I. Trot, *Historia del Dereche Penal de América Latina* [concl'd] (*ibid.*); José Torre Rebello, *Libros Procedentes de Expurges en Poder de la Inquisición de Lima en 1813* (*ibid.*, no. 54); C. H. Salit, *La Política de no Intervención de Canning en la América Española* (*ibid.*); F. del Valle Lersundi, *Juan de Garay, Natural de Gordejuela* (*ibid*); Engel Sluiter, *Dutch Guiana: a Problem in Boundaries* (Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev., Feb.); J. B. Spell, *The Theatre in Mexico City, 1805–1806* (Hispanic Rev., Jan.); Robert Ricard, *Contribution à l'Étude des Fêtes de "Moros y Cristianos" au Mexique* (Jour. des Américanistes, XXIV., fasc. 1); F. W. Fetter, *The Chilean Debt Payment of 1891* (Econ. Hist., II. 8); Alan K. Manchester, *Reminiscences of a Latin American Revolution* [Brazilian revolt of 1924] (South Atlantic Quar., Jan.); Mary Watters, *The Present State of the Church in Venezuela* (Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev., Feb.).

Documents: R. R. Caillet-Bois, *La Misión de Antonini en 1808* (Boletín del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, no. 53); *id., La Expedición de Rubin de Celis en Busca del Méson de Fierre* (*ibid.*, no. 54); E. Ravignani, *El Volumen del Comercio del Río de la Plata, á Comienzes del Virreinato (1779–1781)* (*ibid.*); Lucia Burk Kinnaird, ed., *Creassy's Plan for seizing Panama* (Hispanic Am. Hist. Rev., Feb.).

W. S. R.

Contributions to the section of Historical News have been made by G. C. Boyce, T. R. S. Broughton, E. C. Burnett, John Caughey, E. P. Cheyney, E. N. Curtis, F. C. Dietz, S. B. Fay, J. F. Jameson, W. T. Laprade, L. M. Larson, W. E. Lingelbach, N. Neilson, W. S. Robertson, L. F. Stock, C. S. Sydnor.